

# L E T T E R S

O F

Mr. the ABBOT of \*\*\*

Ex Professor of the HEBREW LANGUAGE,  
in the UNIVERSITY of \*\*\*

T O

Mr. KENNICOTT,

Of the ROYAL SOCIETY in *London*; and  
MEMBER of the COLLEGE OF EXETER,  
in the UNIVERSITY of  
O X F O R D.

---

TRANSLATED FROM THE FRENCH.

---

*Semper ego auditor tantum, nunquam reponam*

*Vexatus toties?*

JUV.

---

P A R I S.

Printed in the Year M.DCC.LXXII.

And sold by the BOOKSELLERS of LONDON and  
WESTMINSTER.

Price 2s. 6d. sewed. or 3s. bound in calf.

L E T T E R S

OF

Mr. the Abbot of

Ex Professor of the French Language  
in the University of

M. KENNICOTT,

Of the Royal Society in London and

Member of the College of

of the University of

Oxford

Translated from the French.

Second edition, with additions.

London, 1757.

Printed in the University of London and  
And sold by the Booksellers of London and



## ADVERTISEMENT.

**I**F the common saying be true,  
That good works only are wor-  
thy to fall under the notice of  
critics, Dr. Kennicott ought to  
be flattered of his performance for  
its passing now my examination.  
I hope he will take it kindly from  
me, and thank me at the same  
time, for the good service I pro-  
cure to his book; whether by  
making it known and relished in  
the different parts of Europe, or  
for occasioning the vend it de-  
serves. To avoid confusion, I  
have divided my reflections into  
letters.

The first is only a kind of in-  
troduction to the matter.

The second will perhaps be unacceptable to some gentlemen library-keepers; they will find therein their manuscripts ill used in some measure; I beg them to excuse me; however it is neither their fault nor mine, if their titles are not brought into a better light.

The third, abounding with several Hebrew passages, is absolutely necessary, whether for shewing the genius of the Hebrew language, or rendering sensible Dr. Kennicott's weakness in that respect, his oversight and little regularity, together with the inutility and inconsistency of his pretended corrections. Besides that, the Hebrew words being rendered

rendered into Latin and French [*English.*] This third letter is, for this precaution sake, reduced indistinctly to the capacity of every reader.

If the fourth and fifth letter, as well as the postscript, displease Dr. Kennicott, it would give me much concern. However, he has a remedy at hand; namely, that of answering me, and resolving the trifling difficulties I propose to him. I desire him, for his own interest's sake, to do me that honour. There is nothing more wanting to his glory, than to force a French Hebrewist to be silent; and I will surely be so, if, as I doubt not, he alledges to me such solid reasons as those he has made

use of to destroy the English  
Hebrewist.

It must be known, that Dr.  
Kennicott has reduced his anta-  
gonists to silence, by the sole  
weight of his authority, giving  
no other reason and answer, than  
*that his time appertains to the  
public*

However, much concern  
a remedy at hand; namely, that  
of answering me, and resolving  
the rising difficulties I propose  
to him. I desire him, for his own  
interest's sake, to do me that ho-  
nour. **THE** There is nothing more  
wanting to his glory, than to once  
a French Hebrewist to be silent;  
and I will surely be so, as I  
doubt not, he pledges to me such  
solid reasons as those he has made

# LETTERS

OF THE

Abbot of \* \* \*, Extra Professor  
of the HEBREW LANGUAGE in  
the University of \* \* \*.

To Dr. KENNICOTT,  
Of the ROYAL SOCIETY in *London*,  
and associated to the Col-  
lege of EXETER in the Univer-  
sity of *Oxford*.

---

## LETTER I.

YOU then are absolutely determined,  
Sir, to make yourself conspicuous in  
the universe. None indeed could go  
better to work for that purpose than you  
have done. Either of the hemispheres  
resound already with your praises: your  
undertaking is already applauded in all  
parts of the world. It is reported that

our printed Hebrew text is corrupted; yet, that a wise man of the first rank is going to reduce it to its primitive lustre. How happy is our present age, and what advantage will our offspring reap from it! Here give me leave to join my feeble voice to the acclamations of your admirers, and congratulate England for having brought forth so great a man. Yea, Sir, your work is a master-piece, which appears to me like a perfect picture, that has no other defect (if it be one) than that of having too much light. I therefore think, that some shades properly intermixed would not be amiss to temper the brightness of it. Give me leave to intersperse some of them in it.

There is not a person, who did not esteem, as the most precious treasure, a perfect edition of the Hebrew Bible; (for I do not deny there are some faults, however very rare, and of little consequence in those we have): But how many necessary materials are there wanting to arrive to that perfection? There are wanting good manuscripts, a profound knowledge in the Hebrew language, a sincere love to the Christian religion,

religion, a great diffidence of ourselves, and especially a great impartiality.

With good and ancient manuscripts, the printed text is accurately collated, its difference perceived, and the reasons of it inquired.

With a profound knowledge in the Hebrew language, both the sense of the letter, and the literal sense of the text, are carefully examined, and the relations of it combined; neither the peculiar genius of that language is lost from our sight, nor the connection that should be predominant, which is really such in the thought of it, nor even the resemblance of some letters of the alphabet, that can yet easier deceive the copiest than the printer; and then the application of those principles are made to the word that offers some difficulty.

With a sincere love to the Christian religion, we are not affected to look after some faults crept into the passages *that have an immediate tendency to faith*; we endeavour to convince men of the goodness, solidity, and holiness of their religion, making them at the same time revere that book which contains it.

With a great diffidence of ourselves, a work of this nature is tremulously performed; no dependence is made on our own judgment; we neither set up as oracles, nor as prophets; and especially, we are very careful not to impose by any falsity or imposture.

Lastly, With impartiality, we surrender ourselves to that labour, merely for the glory of being useful to religion: neither the benefits of the prince, nor the assistance of the great, nor the subscriptions of the curious, ought to be refused; but they are not to be the chief aim of a work. If science gathers laurels, interest should not tarnish them.

All these talents are doubtless united in your person. This I am determined to examine in a few words.

Are you the possessor of good manuscripts?

In order to exalt the excellency of the copies you make use of, you begin by disparaging those on which our bible has been printed.

“ You say, (Dissertation, vol. i. page 247), “ That the errors were therein  
 “ first introduced by some manuscripts  
 “ full of mistakes,” &c. This is precisely what you should not have mentioned;

tioned; because it is false, as we shall shew hereafter.

These manuscripts were neither modern, nor full of mistakes; since Cardinal *Ximenes*, whose edition is esteemed the most important in the church, positively says, That he has applied his utmost attention to select *castigatissima ex omni parte vetustissimaque exemplaria*, the most correct and ancient copies for the press. It seems you are alarmed at these expressions. You run very slightly over it in your Dissertation, (vol. ii. page 479.) However, they are very plain and energetic, and to all appearance you have not lent your attention to them.

“Furnished by Jews, or those who  
“had been of that persuasion.”

That is true; but those Jews the Cardinal has made use of, had turned Christians long before this undertaking; and they were the wisest men of that nation. How dare you offer as a proof so incompatible a reason? Are you not sensible that we have the bible through the channel of the Jews? — that this book has been spread forth among the nations by their means? — that they have always had for the same the most profound veneration, and by an effect of  
Providence,

Providence, they have never dared to diminish from it, or add a single word to it? and you will have them to have wantonly contributed to the corruption of it, by furnishing imperfect manuscripts to print it: This is diametrically opposite to common sense. Whatever the Jews have done, and which is a consequence of their ignorance, is to convert into strange objects the passages which were too conspicuously applied against them, or in favour of Jesus Christ; and they have rather been inclined to excommunicate him, who would calculate Daniel's weeks, than touching the text where their condemnation is so plainly pronounced.

Besides, are you not sensible that this rebuke gives a shake to your whole work? For, in short, if the printed text is corrupted, because manuscripts have been made use of that were furnished by the Jews, what confidence can you expect from your pretended corrections, since all the ancient copies, on which you flatter yourself to improve our text, are of their own hand? And I defy you to produce in this matter any such manuscripts whatsoever, that have not been written by a Jew. Moreover,  
you

you cannot deny, that you have not already your ownself many manuscripts of a Jewish extraction; such are those as are called *Haptharoth* \*; such are the rolls which you find to be of a beautiful perfection: you daily make use of them to rectify the printed text. Ah! by what chance should the Jews of the fifteenth century have furnished bad copies to print the bible? and how could the libraries produce some excellent ones three hundred years after to improve it? This, I think, is a little beyond comprehension. There is however a good reason why: Doubtless you are not ignorant of it. Well, I am going to enlighten with this truth those who are deprived of it.

Before the invention of the press, perhaps there were in Europe less manuscripts than there are now. Why? Because then they relied with the simplicity of their hearts on the "Translations which the church had adopted." The text has been printed after the best manuscripts; it has been respected a long while; the Hebrew language was afterwards studied; and when they thought themselves very skilful in it, because

\* These lectures are appropriated for the use of the *Synagogue of the Jews*.

they

they knew how to read it, and understand it indifferently, the printed text has been examined. Now, as the principles of that language were only superficially known, and the genius which characterizes it was not studied, as a fault of the print, manuscripts were looked for every where, in order to confer them with the printed copy. There were few; but,

*Auri sacra fames.*

As soon as it was known that some advantage could be got from it, millions of them appeared; and as they have had the art of dressing and beautifying them in the garb of a decrepit old age, they have been regarded with the most singular veneration, and the curious have paid for them at the weight of gold. This was what the copiest aimed at.

Such are, Sir, the greatest parts of manuscripts on which you collate, and lay claim to be the reformer of the printed text. Vile children of darkness, who only owe their existence to interest, their goodness to prejudice, and their lustre to imposture! Could they who wrote them ever suspect, that such titles would become competitors? what do I say?  
the

the umpires, nay, the masters of the printed text ?

I say, *the greatest part* ; for there are among them truly respectable with respect to their age ; but after having paid to their antiquity its due homage, ought we to look upon them as unblameable titles ? Are they pure enough ? Are there not gross errors, blunders, &c. ? Are these, at last, copies fit to give a law to the church, and annihilate our text ? This I am going to examine. I will follow as faithfully your arguments, as I have followed your footsteps in the library at Paris.

In the state of the collation of 1767, you say, " Being at Paris, thirty-seven manuscripts which are in the King's library, have been communicated to me ; amongst which, the most ancient and excellent contains the whole bible, and a great number of variations of the utmost consequence."

Extremely well said ; but I am not obliged to take your word for it ; I even have reasons for the contrary, as you will see hereafter. The number of that manuscript should have been produced, and then I should have verified the encumbrances you give to it. Mr. Capperonnier,

as virtuous a citizen, as a wife library-keeper, has done me the favour to communicate these thirty-seven manuscripts; but he could not tell me *that*, which you speak of. However, they are all exactly numbered. Is it oblivion, or artfulness on your part? I know nothing of it. All I can assure is, that besides the thirty-seven manuscripts you speak of, there are many others which you don't mention a word of.

You say, That in the library of *St. Germain des Près*, there are three Hebrew manuscripts. That is true. I even know that you have had them in your lodgings during the time of your residence at Paris, in order to collate them; and you have told one of the library-keepers, that from the three manuscripts you had perused, there was only one very excellent. Why don't you mention any of the variations that are found there? doubtless, you have some reason to leave them in the dark, and I have mine to bring them to light. I will send you some of them with the first post.

You say, That the library of *St. Genevieve* has an Hebrew and Samaritan manuscript, which comprehend a great many

many useful variations. I have seen and examined them both; and I know not why you dissemble the pitiful condition of the Samaritan manuscript. You should rather faithfully agree, that that manuscript does not contain but fragments of the Pentateuch, since it only begins at the 5th verse of the 5th chapter of Genesis: that the first writing is upon parchment; — that there are a great many verses wanting, nay, even whole chapters; — that in many places whole chapters are found to be written on common paper by another hand. What magnificent variations should you have found in what is wanting! I have extracted some from those which remain: you will see them. With respect to the Hebrew manuscript, it would be a third larger, if there were not one third omitted from it.

I will quote to you some of the omissions I speak of.

The libraries of the P P. *del Oratoire of St. Victor, and of the Minimis*, were likewise opened to you. The Oratoriens have eight Hebrew and two Samaritan manuscripts. You say, That one of these two last is the same which Mr. *Morin* has made use of for his edition of  
the

the Samaritan Pentateuch; and among the manuscripts of that kind which are in Europe, to the number of sixteen, it is the only one that was published." That may be.

The libraries of *St. Victor*, and of the *Minimis*, have none of them but one single Hebrew manuscript. You say not a word of it, and I drop it.

Lastly, You look for manuscripts even into China, (Col. 1768,) you say, (Col. 1764), they have even made inquiries in America, but without success, in regard to Hebrew manuscripts of a particular antiquity.

I am not amazed at this inconsiderable success. Give me leave to tell you, that you have not gone to work the right way; you should have made it public in America and China from the year 1750.

"Mr. Benjamin Kennicott, English Doctor, gives notice, That he wants to reform the printed text; for that purpose he wants some ancient Hebrew manuscripts: whosoever furnishes him with them, will be handsomely rewarded."

Ten years after, a good many, and even the most ancient, should have been produced to you; yet time must be allowed

allowed the copiest to write and disguise them.

What surprises me, is, that you add, " I am however informed, that such " manuscripts may be found among the " Jews in that part of the world." Ah! supposing there were any, would you be the more advanced for it? Do you then forget, that one of your reflections on Cardinal Ximenes's Bible, is, That it has been printed after the manuscripts furnished by the Jews, or by those who had been of this persuasion? And should you be tempted to have some of their own hand, why should the Jews of America be more honest than those of Spain?

Again, you quote, in your first Dissertation, (p. 342.) the manuscript, No. 68. of Cambridge library, as an *uncommon piece, containing considerable variations.*

Well and good: let your subscribers take your word; but I, to whom a person of faith has sent some extracts of it, and depend more on his fidelity than on your discourses, will analogize it, and shew the esteem which ought to be made of it: I will not forget also to say a few words  
B . concerning

concerning the manuscripts of the Samaritan text in the Polyglot, to which you lay claim to improve the printed Hebrew text.

As these particulars will be a little extensive, and of consequence would here trespass beyond the limits of a common letter, I am determined to finish this by two reflections on your undertaking. They will appear to you like pills, that are bitter to be swallowed when they are not gilded; but I cannot help bringing them to light.

In the first place, exactness ought to be the basis of your labour; because, from the moment it is perceived that you are deceived, you will no more be read but with disgust, or at least with fear. A wise man who endeavours to instruct himself in so interesting a book as yours, wants to be assured that you do not put one word for another. If, as I doubt not, you are convinced of this truth, why do you offer us falsities? Here follows a pattern of them.

You say in your first Dissertation, (p. 1.) That the printed text imports :

In the printed text.

*anebenoo* *anachenoo.*  
11 Sam. v. 1. אֲנִי אֲנִי it is false, it is אֲנִי

page

page 227

*haroobnao**haroobenee.*

1 Chron. xi. 42. הראובנו idem.

הראובני

page 427.

*mininou**miemcenow.*

Deut. xxxiii. 2. מינינו idem.

מימנו

page 482.

*jawreeyoath**jaringoath.*

1 Chron. ii. 18. יריות idem.

ריעות

And in the following page, you have put  
twice following, יריות when it is ריעות

Do you forge such barbarous words that are of no language at all, only to ridicule the printed text? Very likely, you will tell me, that those faults are committed by the printer. No, Sir, these faults are of your own making; and I have a convincing proof of my assertion; first, with respect to the feminine word מימנה (*meemecnaw*) which is found in the Samaritan version that you maintain (Dissertation i. page 430.) to be of the masculine gender, מימנו (*meemenow*) as in the printed Hebrew text; secondly, because you tell us in your second Dissertation, (page 186.) that you found a Manuscript which in Deut. v. 18. reads לא תגור [low tharwoaf] whereas the

printed text reads וְלֹא תִנָּוֶה [ *valow thawgoaf* ] I have no manner of doubt but your Manuscripts bear such blunders ; but I defy you to shew me any Edition where the word תִּנָּוֶה [ *thawgoaf* ] and the aforesaid words are found ; thirdly, because in your first Dissertation (p. 428.) you boldly advance, that in Habac. iii. 3. the printed text imports פָּאֵרֶן כֶּסֶּה [ *Paran keesay* ] whereas it stands פָּאֵרֶן סֵלֶה כֶּסֶּה [ *Paran Sailaw Keesay.* ] Indeed, Sir, such inadvertencies give no credit to your work ; I leave the other untouched, let us go to the second reflection.

We have in France one of the most respectable men both for his virtues and age. This is the Reverend Father *Houbigant*, an Orator. He has attempted the same undertaking as you have done ; In vain, after forty years labour, four large volumes in folio, of an Hebrew bible, reprinted at his cost, and loaded with his pretended corrections, had availed him to sink down the gate of memory's temple, and this seemed to lead him to immortality. — His glory disappeared. — Why ? Because not having done in his work either the use, or necessary application to the peculiar genius of the Hebrew language ; and having  
never

never proved his corrections but by his own sentiments only, the true Hebrewists easily perceived he was only superficial; and from thence inferred, that the faults he declared were only chimeras; and thus he kept close to his printed text. Let us now argue on this last text.

Do you think to know the Hebrew language better than the Father Houbigant? I question it; and although you pay him that compliment, saying, That he is a very venturesome man\*, and that he would have acted prudently not to have exposed certain critics, which appear to you too hazarded; although Dr. *Hunt*, a flatterer to your labours, exhausts himself with compliments to exalt you to the clouds; although you may beautify the state of your collections with the most respectable names in Europe, which perhaps I revere with more sincerity than you do; although at last you may have forced Fame to carry your name from one pole of the world to the other; yet for all that, I, who am not seduced by appearances,

\* Dissert. vol. ii. p. 488.

nor dazzled either by the acclamations of a credulous rabble, or the splendor of an affected knowledge ; I say, I am convinced, that you know how to read Hebrew ; but have not a perfect knowledge of the principles and genius of that language.

Doubtless you will argue, That the comparison I make between the Father Houbigant and you is not just, since you consult twenty times more manuscripts than he. That is true likewise. But what does accrue from it ? Twenty times more uncertainty on the Hebrew language. Here are already three of you who have so openly attacked the printed text. I am persuaded, that among you three have already found more than twenty thousand faults in it. Let there come another as venturesome as you are, and not a word will remain in the Hebrew bible, the sincerity of which may be warranted. Be then conscious of the consequences of your undertaking ; it never can give you honour, and the result of it will only be an ill-conceived work, a work incongruous to the rules of sound criticism ; totally useless, and more proper to dazzle by a vain shew of pretended corrections, than  
to

to instruct by solid arguments. Thus, believe me, change your object, if you are eager to gain an honourable reputation in the literary world. Follow the example of the great men who have been the ornament of your nation. Make yourself conspicuous like Newton, Pope, Milton, &c. through the means of some fine work, where the superiority of your genius may be perceived to shine. Then I will do you justice; and were I obliged to spend every night with you, like with gloomy Young, in the midst of sprites and tombs, I would respect your talents, and have a sincere pleasure to subscribe myself,

S I R,

Your's, &c.

## L E T T E R II.

S I R,

**H**A V I N G engaged myself to convey you some of my news with the first post. I am as good as my word; and as I would not encroach upon your time with idle tales, I come to the fact. The matter in question is to appraise the manuscripts you make use of. As you say nothing of those that have been imparted to you at the King's Library, but only *that the most ancient and excellent among them* contain a great number of variations of the utmost consequence; and not knowing which it is, I am forced to follow your silence in this respect; but I will not be so complaisant to some others: and although you think it not proper to mention some variations that are found therein, yet I think myself obliged to give in your stead a small pattern of them, in order to shew your subscribers, and all the Christian world, the confidence they ought to have in your labour, as well as in the materials you make use of.

In

(a) In the first place let us see the three Manuscripts of *St. Germain des Près*. The Manuscript No. 1. contains the *Pentateuch*, (b) *Megiloth* and *Haphtbaroth*. You believe them to be written in the thirteenth century: that may be. It is your interest to give the Manuscripts you make use of an ancient date; but had I been the library-keeper, I never would have suffered you to have fixed, with your own hand, the age of my Manuscripts. Besides, by this means it appears you assume a scientific air, and even that of superiority in knowledge, which becomes no man. I am therefore persuaded, that your dates are arbitrary in the utmost degree. I'll endeavour to prove them to be such very soon.

(a) Note, That in the following extracts, which are not the hundredth part of what can be produced, the lessons of the column at the *left hand* are those that are found in the text of *Vander Hooght's* edition; the column at the *right hand* contains the different lessons in the text of the *manuscript*. I have put the same words in English characters over the *Hebrew* words, in order to shew how they are to be read, and the signification of either word and phrase are in the original, in French, and here in English opposite the Hebrew, in order that all those who are not versed in Hebrew might comprehend and see the difference of them.

(b) These are Solomon's Songs, Ruth, Ecclesiastes, Lamentations and Esther, to which the Jews give that name.

## MANUSCRIPT, No. 1.

As there are in the beginning of the Pentateuch, one or two sheets that cannot be read, I have deducted some variations from an infinite number that are found in the Haptharoth.

## HAPHTHARA, page 150.

## JUDGES, CHAP. IV.

## The Printed Text.

*he*  
v. 4. וְהָיָה *which, or*  
who, or her, she.  
*iawbow ish him*  
20. אִם אִישׁ יָבֹא *If*  
*anyone comes.*

## The Manuscript.

*vahe*  
4. וְהָיָה *and she,*  
who, &c.  
*iawbow him*  
20. אִם יָבֹא *if com-*  
*eth.*

23. כְּנָעַן *Canaan*  
[n. p.]

*Written on an Erase-*  
*ment.*

## CHAP. V.

*Deborah*

v. 1. דְּבוֹרָה [*a pro-*  
*per name.*]

v. 1. דְּבוֹרָהּ (De-  
borahath)

*Malachim*

3. מַלְכִּים *Kings*

{ The final ך is ve-  
ry small, and it has  
been added by a-  
nother writer.

## JUDGES, CHHP. V.

18. חרה exposed	<div style="display: inline-block; vertical-align: middle;"> <div style="display: inline-block; vertical-align: middle;">{</div> <div style="display: inline-block; vertical-align: middle;">Was primitively חרב (chereb) which signifies a sword, and after- wards altered by another hand.</div> <div style="display: inline-block; vertical-align: middle;">}</div> </div>
30. לראשנבר to each man.	<div style="display: inline-block; vertical-align: middle;"> <div style="display: inline-block; vertical-align: middle;">{</div> <div style="display: inline-block; vertical-align: middle;">The word לראש to each is omitted.</div> <div style="display: inline-block; vertical-align: middle;">}</div> </div>

HAPTHARAH, page 158.

The I. and III. of Kings, in the French Bible.

## CHAP. XVIII.

The Printed Text.	Manuscript.
<i>haia</i> v. 1. היה he was, or it was.	1. היתה she was
<i>Achab</i> 2. אחאב [ a proper name.	2. אחאב signi- fies nothing.
<i>chamishim</i> 4. חמשים fifty.	Twice written.
<i>halah vengobadecarwho</i>	
6. ועבדיהו הלך } And O- } bediah } went a- } lone, or } by him- } self, by } another } way.	Omitted.

ברוך אחר לברו

I. and

## I. and II. of KINGS; CHAP. XVIII.

<i>leh atmer athah</i>	<i>leh omer lehatha</i>
11. אַתָּה אָמַר לֵךְ thou	11. אַתָּה לֵךְ אָמַר לֵךְ
sayest, go.	thou go, say go.

<i>edang low asher</i>	<i>edang asher</i>
12. אֲשֶׁר לֹא יָדָע that will	12. אֲשֶׁר יָדָע
be unknown to me.	that will be

<i>bharog</i>	<i>bearrit</i>
13. בְּהָרוֹת when he slew.	13. בְּהַכְרִית fig-
	nifies the same.

<i>Achab</i>	
16. אַחָאב [ a proper	
name]	Omitted.

<i>Ze</i>	
17. זֶה this, that or he.	
19. הַאֲשֵׁרָה the groves.	19. הַאֲשֵׁרָה Af-

	<i>fyria.</i>
20. בָּנֵי the children	20. גְּבֻל limits

## The I. of Kings, CHAP. XVIII.

## The Printed Text.

<i>habangal vehim</i>	
21. וְאַם הַבַּעַל	or if Baal
<i>acharav lecou</i>	[is God]
לְכוּ אַחֲרָיו.	follow
	him.
24. וַיַּעַן and he answered.	24. וַיַּעֲנוּ and
	they answered.

The

The Manuscript No. 2. which you pretend was written in the twelfth century, \* begins at Joshua, &c. Here follow some variations.

## JOSHUA, CHAP. I.

The printed Text.

*bengod key*

v. 11. כִּי בְעוֹר for  
within [three  
days.]

*J. asher*

15. אֲשֶׁר הָ that the  
Lord.

*authah*

Id. אֹתָהּ her, or that

*col*

16. כָּל all.

Id. תִּשְׁלַחְנוּ thou  
feest us.

The Manuscript.

*mibengod*

} signifies  
nothing

11. מִבְּעוֹר }

*J. Ferushtatchem Asher*

15. אֲשֶׁר יִרְשָׁתֶכֶם הָ  
that you possess  
the Lord.

Omitted.

*kecal*

16. כָּל as all.

Id. תִּשְׁלַחְנוּ no He-  
brew.

## JOSHUA, CHAP. II.

The printed Text.

*henay*

v. 2. הִנֵּה behold.

The Manuscript.

Omitted.

\* Here you plainly see the arbitrary dates the Doctor gives to this Manuscript. For I do not think there is much difference between the writing of the twelfth and thirteenth century, to give the Manuscript No. 2, a hundred years less, than to that of No. 1.

JOSHUA

## JOSHUA, CHAP. II.

The printed Text.

*aimatchem*9. אימתכם your  
terror.*key*

10. כי for

*na hishabengoo*

12. השבעו נא

*j' ba lee*

לי בה

*elaihe wayomeroo*

17. ויאמרו אליה

swear  
unto  
me  
then,  
by toe  
Lord.and  
they  
fold  
her  
to  
Ra-  
hab.

The Manuscript.

Before that word  
he has added איתם  
which is of no lan-  
guage.

כי of no language.

*na hishamengoo*

12. השמעו נא

*j' ba lee*

לי בה

*lahem wayomeroo*

17. ויאמרו להם

and  
they told them.

Instead of the

word להם [la-

hem] and they

have put אליהם

in the margin,

which gives it

no better sense.

hear-  
ken  
unto  
me  
then  
bythe  
Lord.

## CHAP. III.

*sham vavalieneu*

V. I. וילנו שם

And  
they  
lodged  
there  
[or  
tarried  
there.]*sham wayelchen*

I. וילכו שם

And they  
went there

CHAP.

JOSHUA, CHAP. III.

The printed Text.

The Manuscript.

*Kierathem*

v. 3. כראתכם when  
you shall see.

*brerathem*

בראתכם they have  
put a ב instead of  
a כ.

*meod harechek*

16. מרחק מאד very  
far.

The adverb מאד *ve-*  
*ry*, is omitted.

*bow thaleneu asher*

IV. 3. אשר תלינו בו  
where you shall  
lodge.

*ngalou bow thaleneu asher*

אשר תלינו בו עליו  
where you shall  
lodge upon him.

CHAP. IV.

*vainbreroom*

8. ויעבדום } And carry  
                  } them or trans-  
                  } porting them.

*vaiangbiedoom*

ויעבדום signified:  
*they have served*  
*them*; but as the ׳  
is after the ב, the  
whole word is of  
no signification at  
all.

JOSHUA,

## JOSHUA, CHAP. V.

The printed Text. The Manuscript.

*harotham lebelthy*  
 v. 6. לבלתי הראותם. That he would  
*asher aharets eth* not shew them  
 את הארץ אשר that land that the  
*j' nishbang* Lord had sworn  
 נשבע ה [to give them.] Omitted.

*bearbangah* The  
 10. בארבעה four-  
*jom ngasar* teen  
 עשר יום day or  
 in four-  
 teen  
 days.  
 In the fourteenth  
 of the *first month*.

*bephesah*  
 11. הפסח the pass-  
 over. no Hebrew.

*vehinah*  
 13. והנה and ob-  
 served. *נה* was primitively  
 three letters, which  
 were erased in such  
 a manner that one  
 cannot distinguish  
 what sort of letters  
 they framed former-  
 ly.

The Manuscript No. 3, contains the  
 Pentateuch, Magiloth, and Haphtharoth.  
 And here follows some Variations.

GENESIS,

## GENESIS, CHAP. I.

The Printed Text.

The Manuscript.

*unqueba*

v. 27. ונקבה and female. | noHebrew ונקיבה

## CHAP. II.

10.

*micol*

v. 3. מכל of all or every.

Omitted.

*begneden gann**begneden gam*

8. גן בעדן a garden in Eden.

8. גם בעדן also in Eden.

*Hayat*

19. חית Animals.

חייית No Hebrew.

*lo jikra asher vecol*and וכל אשר יקרא לו  
all [the names]  
he gave them.

Omitted.

*maza lo*20. לא מצא he found  
not.20. לו מצא he  
found to him.

## CHAP. III.

*vaehabe*

10. ואחבא and I hid myself. | noHebrew ואיחבא

*ishech**ashech*

16. אישך Thy Husband. | 16. אישך thy fire.

*besargnat*

19. בזעת in the sweat. | בזיעת No Hebrew.

C

CHAP.

## C H A P. IV.

- |  |                                    |
|--|------------------------------------|
| <p><i>im</i><br/>7. אם If<br/><i>gnod</i><br/>25. עוד yet.</p> | <p>Written twice.<br/>Omitted.</p> |
|--|------------------------------------|

The dates which are at the end of this Manuscript are very peculiar, It is dated by two different persons; one says that he has written, and finished it on Thursday the fourth day of the month *Ab*, which answers *July* the year 5063 of the creation of the world.

יום הר באב שנת חמשת אלפים  
וששים ושלש לבריאת עולם. &c.

And the other says that his Mother made him a present of the aforesaid Manuscript on Monday the first day of the month *Yyar* (April) the Year 5063 of the creation of the World, &c.

היום יום ברה אייר שנת ה אלפים וסג  
לבריה קבלתי מאמי זה החומש במתנה. &c.

This last date in which this person says that his Mother made him a present of it, is anterior by three months to the preceding. However two things ought to be observed; the first, that instead of a ם, which amounts to (60) he had put a ש, which

which amounts to (300) having barred the same, in order to shew it was an error; the second that you have not mentioned at all that of the second date: I cannot tell the reason.

I think that this light description of variations I just have alledged concerning the three manuscripts aforesaid, is sufficient to enable the meanest Hebrewist for appraising them. If, however, any scruple should remain in this respect, I bring it to a fact, and offer to prove they are not the hundredth part of the unskilful notions and gross blunders that are found in them.

Let's go over to the manuscripts of *St. Genevieve*. There are two of them, viz. one in *Samaritan* and the other in *Hebrew*. I have promised you some variations of the Samaritan copy. Here they are.

# GENESIS, CHAP. V.

The Hebrew printed Text.	The Samaritan Manuscript.
-----------------------------	------------------------------

<i>shanah umeath</i> v. 18. וּמֵאֵת שָׁנָה an hundred years.	Omitted. sic v. 35
--	--------------------

## GENESIS, CHAP. V.

The Hebrew printed Text.	The Samaritan Manuscript.
-----------------------------	------------------------------

<i>shailoshab</i> 28. שלשה <i>shanab ushmoanim</i> ושמנים שנה <i>shana umath</i> ומאת שנה	<i>shethaim</i> 28. שתים <i>vachameshim</i> וחמשים <i>shanab</i> שנה	fifty- three years.
--	---	---------------------------

## CHAP. VI.

<i>bachai umicol</i> 19. ומכל החי <i>bassar micol</i> מכל בשר <i>unkaibab zacar</i> זכר ונקבה <i>ibeiew</i> יהיו <i>mehangoph</i> מהעוף <i>remiesh mecol</i> מכל רמש <i>baadamah</i> האדמה	and of every liv- ing thing of all flesh They shall be male and female. of the fowls and every creeping thing of the earth.	<i>baceiab umicol</i> 19. ומכל החיה <i>bassar mical</i> ומכל בשר <i>unkeba Zacar</i> זכר ונקבה <i>ken vaiche</i> ויהי כן <i>hangoph</i> העוף <i>asher micol</i> מכל אשר <i>baadama remes</i> רמש האדמה	and of every animal and of every flesh. male and fe- male and it was so. the fowls of all thing that creeps the earth [or on the earth]
---	---	---	---

The Hebrew printed  
Text.

*basbamaim*

3. השמים of heaven.

The Samaritan  
Manuscript.

*batabor asbamaim*

השמים המהור

the  
hea-  
vens  
the  
pure.

## EXOD. CHAP. XX.

*shalifim*

5. שלישים the third ge-  
neration.

*shaleshim*

5. שלישים this  
word signifies  
princes, dukes, or  
captains. Vide  
Ezek. xxiii. 15.  
1 Chron. xi. ii.  
and xii. 18. Sic  
Deut. v. 12.

*tangabasse lo*

v. 10. לא תעשה thou  
shalt not do.

*bow thangasse lo*

10. לא תעשה בו  
the word בו  
an addition in  
it. See Deut.  
ver. 9.

*asber*

11. אשר which is.

This word is omit-  
ted in the Text  
and added in the  
margin by an-  
other hand.

## DEUTER. CHAP. V.

<i>mimangal</i>	<i>megnul</i>
8. ממעל from above.	8. מעל above.
<i>laham tistachave lo</i>	<i>lahem tistachave lo</i>
9. לא תשתחוה להם	9. לא תשתחוי להם
thou shalt not wor-	The letter , is
shipped them.	wrongly placed
	instead of the ה

I should have extracted more, and even the most remarkable of them, if the greatest part of the sheets, and whole Chapters of that manuscript, were not transposed to such a degree, that there is an immense trouble to collate them. I likewise would have given a sample of the variations of proper names, if the greatest part of them were not the same as those of the *Samaritan Pentateuch*, the *London Poliglot*, and the *Samaritan manuscript of Morin*. But my time is not become like yours, *the time of the Public*, (a) it is yet mine; and I should

(a) Note, That some very rational criticks having appeared against Dr. Kennicott, instead of giving them an answer, said, *That his time became the time of the public*; and thro' this means he dispensed himself of resolving

should much lament that time which the  
aforesaid extracts cost me, had it not been  
useful to find the price of your materials.

With respect to the Hebrew manuscripts  
I have only exposed the omissions of the  
nine first chapters of Genesis, amongst  
which is found a very curious addition,

# GENESIS, CHAP. I.

The printed Text.

*elohim*  
v. 16. אלהים God.

Omitted in the  
manuscript.

# CHAP. II.

*bayom vaiishbot*

2. וישבת ביום.

*micol bashebigni*

השביעי מכל

*gnasa asher melac bto*

מלאכתו אשר עשה

and rest-  
ed in the  
seventh  
day of  
all the  
work  
that he  
had  
done.

Omitted in the  
manuscript.

C 4

GENESIS

resolving the objections that were stated against him.  
—Vid. this letter inserted in the *Library or Moral and  
Critical Magazine* for August, 1761, in answer to an  
anonymous letter addressed to him in the same maga-  
zine, for the month of the preceding July, and the  
*Postscript* of the pretended answer to the letter of Dr.  
*Rutherford*; of Cambridge.

## GENESIS, CHAP. III.

## The printed Text.

- baadam*  
22. האדם the man  
*lagnabod*  
23. לעבד to cultivate.  
*gnez*  
24. עץ the tree.

Omitted in the manuscript.

## CHAP. IV.

## In the Manuscript

- chatath*  
[7. חטאת the sin.

*chatat ata*  
7. אתה חטאת  
thou the sin.  
*This is a very  
curious addi-  
tion.*

- Cain*  
22. קין [a proper name] Omitted.

GENESIS,

## GENESIS. CHAP. V.

The printed Text.

*shana meoth iusbang*  
 v. 26. ושבַע מאות שנה  
 and seven hundred  
 years.

## CHAP. VII.

*neshe*

13. נשי the women of

## CHAP. VIII.

7. the whole verse.

## CHAP. IX.

*damo*

4. דמו his blood.

*meyad*

מִיָּד from the hand

*mabul gnod*11. עוד מִבּוּל yet the  
 deluge.Omitted in the  
 Manuscript.

Let us now examine that rare piece,  
 nay that famous Manuscript No. 65, of  
 Cambridge's public Library, wherein ma-  
 ny considerable variations are found.

You say (in Dissertation the First, page  
 342.) that is is written by *Jacob Levy*, and  
 dated with these words הַתּוֹרָה לִיצִירָה were  
 there no more than these two expressions,  
 there

there would be no difficulty at all ; because it would signify the year 610 ; for as you most certainly know the letters only marked with an acute accent stand for the number. But immediately after, there follows in the same manuscript לבנין בית הבחירה signifying *to the Construction of the Temple*. It was Jacob Levy's duty to say, whether this is to be understood of the first, second, or third temple, and respecting to you, in seeing these last words, you should have made the necessary calculation, by which means you would spare one the trouble of it.

The first temple, erected to the glory of the Lord by *Solomon*, was finished and consecrated in the year of the creation 2999, one thousand and one year before the incarnation. From that time, if the manuscript has been written 610 years after that first construction, it ought to have 2163 years this present year 1771.

The second temple was erected after the return of the captivity, and it was consecrated in the year of the world 3489, and 511 years before Jesus Christ. This manuscript is from that time later than this work 610 years, therefore it must have now 1572.

If

If the matter in question regards the the third temple, builded by Herod, and finished in the year 3987, the title it must bear at this present time is 1174, and it consequently appertains to the sixth century. If this date be true, I do agree that this is one of the most ancient manuscripts in Europe: But is it the better for it?— This is a question I am going to discuss in the most methodical way I possibly can.

The first *variations* that are found there are among the number of words that are of no language at all.

### EXAMPLES.

The printed Text.

The manuscript.

GENES. XXX. 22.

*elohim elaiha*

אלהים the Lord אליהם one word  
hearkened to her.

was only made  
of two, which is  
of no language  
at all.

LEV. XXVII. 11.

*la*

לָהּ for the Lord.

לָהּ

DEUT. 1. 25.

*vaieredu*

וַיֵּרְדּוּ and carried them.

וַיֵּרְדּוּ

The

The printed Text.	The manuscript.
JOSHUA, xvi. 10.	
<i>Hakenagnani</i>	
הכנעני the Cananites.	הנעני
IDEM xxiv. 11.	
<i>Haemoree</i>	
האמרי the Amorites.	יהאמרי
JUDGES ix. 1.	
<i>lemore</i>	
לאמר saying	לאמרו

The second *variations* are of the words which although Hebrew, yet do not offer any relative sense to the passages where they are found.

## EXAMPLES.

The printed Text.	The Manuscript.
EXOD. xxxii. 26.	
<i>elave</i>	<i>eli</i>
אלי to him.	אלי to me.
LEV. iv. 35.	
<i>athem</i>	<i>athab</i>
אתם them [with him]	אתה thou or this
NUMB. xxi. 7.	[will]
<i>vayomeru</i>	<i>vayomer</i>
ויאמרו and they said.	ויאמר and he said.

The

## The printed Text.

DEUT. xxi. 2.

*begnarim*

הערים the cities.

JOSH. v. 14.

*low*

לא not.

JUD. ix. 51.

*vayagnalu*

ויעלו and they went up.

I SAM. xvi. 13.

Tetragram<sup>n</sup> rooachרוח ה the spirit of  
the Lord.

## The Manuscript.

*bagnir*

העיר the city.

*low*

לו to him.

*vayaynal*ויעל and he went  
up.*alebem roouch*רוח אליהם the spi-  
rit to them.

It must be observed that there are five letters in the Hebrew alphabet, which have five others, that resemble them much in shape.

ב Beth | ג Guimall | ד Daleth | ה a | מ Mem  
& כ Caph | & נ Noon | & ר Raysh | & ק Keesh | & ס Samec

There is a great number of manuscripts where faults are found in these five letters. Whether they have been badly shaped, or the manuscripts we have now, (as I presume) be mostly written by young people, or other persons who knew to read Hebrew, but did not understand it, sufficiently

sufficiently, to comprehend what they were copying; your manuscript, though ever so ancient, may be yet faulty in that part,

## E X A M P L E S.

The printed Text.

I SAM. XXV. 16.

*chomah*

חומה a wal.

2 SAM. XXI. 18.

*Begob*

בגב at Gob.

I KING. III. 6.

*bazay cayom*

כיום הזה as it is this day

ID. XVII. 20.

*awnee asher*

אשר אני

*gnimab mitgorer*

מתגורר עמה

with

whom

I dwell.

The Manuscript.

*bemay or homay*

המה a noise or tumult. Vide I

Kings, chap. I.

ver. 14. & Prov.

XX. I. ע"כ.

*benob*

בנב at Nob.

*bazay bayom*

ביום הזה in this day

Instead of the verb  
to dwell, he put  
מתגורר with a  
ך at the end,  
and that signifies  
nothing.

The

E X A M P L E S.

The printed Text.	The Manuscript.
PROV. vi. 3.	
<i>itrauphes</i> התרפס bow down.	התרפס <i>signifies no-</i> <i>thing,</i> except there were a inserted after the letter ה then it would signify <i>the images.</i> Vid. Genesis xxxi. 19, &c.

I was assured that in the collation of the manuscript, almost 1400 *variations* can be produced of those three species I have just mentioned.

The following are words that had no sense in the first writing, but have been mended and rendered congruous to the printed Text by another hand.

E X A M -

## EXAMPLES.

The printed Text.		The Manuscript.
GEN. xxxviii. 28.		
<i>belidthab</i>		<i>bediltbab</i>
בלדתה when she	these	ברלתה in her
was delivered.	words	coverlead.
EXOD. ii. 16.	were	
<i>lebastiet</i>	origi-	
להשקות to walter or	nally	להשהות of no
to give drink.		language.
LEV. vi. 13.		
<i>thumid</i>		<i>thameem</i>
תמיד always.		תמים perfect.

Of this sort there are about 234 corrections.

5th There are found likewise very curious additions, that are made by the writer himself. It is a pity most of them are divested of common sense.

## EXAMPLES.

The printed Text.	The manuscript.
GEN. xi. 9.	
<i>hagegone</i>	<i>uméchom haugone</i>
הגן of the garden.	הגן ומשם of the
	garden and from
	thence.

EXAM-

## EXAMPLES.

The printed Text.

GEN. xxxvii. 14.

*vauiomair*

וַיֹּאמֶר

*lake low*

לֹךְ לֹךְ

and said

to him

go.

The manuscript.

*bauesh Joseph varviaylake*

וַיֹּלֶךְ יוֹסֵף הָאִישׁ

*lake low vauiomair na'ys*

נֹסֵי אִמְרָ לֹךְ לֹךְ

and Joseph went,  
the man fled, and  
said to him go.

EXOD. xviii. 24.

*Moshay*

מֹשֶׁה Moses.

*Moshay marw*

מֶה מֹשֶׁה what Moses.

ID. xxv. 1.

*Tet. varwidawbair*

וַיְדַבֵּר ה'

*Moshay ell*

אֵל מֹשֶׁה

and the  
Lord  
spake  
unto  
Moses.*T' varwidawbair*

וַיְדַבֵּר ה'

*Moshay T' ell*

אֵל ה' מֹשֶׁה

and the  
Lord  
spake unto  
the Lord  
Moses

NUMB. xi. 1.

*wrong*

רָע

*T' baaznay*

בְּאָזְנֵי ה'

that dis-  
pleased  
the ears  
of the  
Lord.*baanganay wrong*

רָע בְּעֵינֵי

*T' baaznay*

בְּאָזְנֵי ה'

that dis-  
pleased  
the eyes,  
the ears  
of the  
Lord.

D

EXAM-

## E X A M P L E S.

The printed Text.

DEUT. xi. 31.

*Sichone ath*

את סיחון

*attso vaath*

ואת ארצו

Sicheon

is his

country.

The Manuscript.

*lickrawthansw Sichone ath*

את סיחון לקראתנו

*artso vaath who*

הוא ואת ארצו

Siche-

on, to

meet us

him,

and

his

coun-

try.

There are 330 additions of this kind in the manuscript.

6th Item more than 300 erasements : I only give two for an example.

The printed Text.

GENES. ii. 22.

*atsailong*

הצלל the rib.

1D. vi. 21.

*valwwbem laikaw*

לך ולזהם for thee

and for them.

The Manuscript.

the צ is on an erasement.

There are between these two words three or four erased letters.

7th, There are more than 630 omissions, comprehending therein eleven whole verses, the greatest part whereof destroys the sense

sense of the passages. I only give two for examples.

The printed Text.

GEN. i. 26.

*bawraamaraiſh*

הרמש reptile.

ID. iii. 15.

*ooben zavrgnawkaw*

ובין זרעך thy seed,

and between.

Omitted in the  
manuscript.

8th Item, We find about 450 words or doubtful letters, which supply you with materials for enlarging the collations, and sublime questions to be decided.

9th Item, There are about 120 repetitions, among which there are only three repeated verses, viz. the 12th verse of chap. the 31st of Genesis; the 17th verse of the 6th chap. of Exodus; and the 10th verse of the 11th chap. of Isaiah. Here are some repetitions.

The printed Text.

GEN. xiii. 2.

*veabram*

ואברם and Abram.

Twice written in the  
Manuscript.

## E X A M P L E S.

The printed Text.

GEN. xvii. 8.

*aratst col ath magoorakaw*

מִנְרִיךְ אֶת כָּל אֶרֶץ

where thou art a  
stranger. The  
whole land of  
Canaan.

xxviii. 5.

*Bathnel ben Labwan ell*

אֵל לָבָן בֶּן בְּתוּאֵל

*Reeb' carw awkee barwawrawmee*

חָאֲרָמִי אָחִי רִבְקָה

*wangassawf iarwawwacob am*

אִם יַעֲקֹב וְעִשָׂו by

Laban the son  
of Bethuel the  
Syrian, Rebec-  
cah's brother,  
Jacob and Esau's  
mother,

Twice written in the  
manuscript.

10th Idem, We find some transpositions  
which give no great idea of the writer's  
knowledge; a witness thereof is the word  
צִיִּאֲדוֹן [*tseeaudon*] which is of no language  
at all.

E X A M -

## EXAMPLES.

## JEREMIAH, CHAP. XLVI.

The printed Text.

*J lanawdoanawhe*10. לַאֲדֹנֵי ה' to the  
Lord God.

The Manuscript.

*lauawdoanawhe lau J*לַאֲדֹנֵי to God,  
to the Lord.

## JUDGES, CHAP. X.

*tfedon alowba vaath*

6. וְאֵת אֱלֹהֵי צִדּוֹן

*Moab alowba vaath*וְאֵת אֱלֹהֵי מוֹאָב and  
the Gods of Si-  
deon, and the  
Gods of Moab.*Moab alowba vaath*

וְאֵת אֱלֹהֵי מוֹאָב

*alowba vaath*

וְאֵת אֱלֹהֵי

*tfedon tfeawdon*צִדּוֹן and the  
Gods of Moab  
and the Gods of  
[Seadon] Sideon.

Lastly, if the initial or final letters are larger or smaller ; if they are coloured, or ornamented with some pictures ; if a word or a sentence is left without points ; if one line is filled with some initial letters of the following line, or the void space supplied by a larger letter than the others ; if a word is abbreviated, or the last letter is put over the word as a caret, for want of room, &c. You are observed to smile affectuously at the manuscript, and fetch an insulting sigh on account of the printed

text, overflowing us with a croud of arguments, as ill grounded as useless.

The collation of that manuscript gives you about 12,000 variations, and I maintain that your useless remarks on the afore-said objects, and even the marginal notes, that the writer has transferred in the text herein comprehended, there are not 4500; besides, the remainder you give us as variations are not so at all. Here I am going to add some for the curious reader.

### EXAMPLES.

#### The printed Text.

JUD. xvi. 24.

אויבנו

I SAM. iv. 3.

אויבנו

LEV. vi. 13.

האפה

EZEK. xlv. 13.

האפיה

2 KINGS xxiv. 13.

אוצרות

I CHRON. xxvii. 25.

אוצרות

NUMB. iv. 5.

ארון

ID. io. 33.

ארון

#### The manuscript.

אויבנו

Our enemies.

אויבנו

האיפה

An Ephra (a kind of measure.)

האפה

אוצרות

Treasures.

אוצרות

ארון

The Ark.

ארון

These

These pretended variations are just of the same importance as it would be in the French language the difference of orthography in the following words, which alternately might be found either in print, or in a manuscript.

Printed.	Manuscript.
Nôtre ours	N tre our
Nostre	Notre
Hôpital Hospital	Hospital
Hospital	Hôpital
Vôtre yours	Vostre
Vostre	Vôtre
Sol penny	Sous
Sou	Sol
Col neck	Cou
Cou	Col.

Moreover, if I have enlarged more on the manuscript, No. 68, of Cambridge's Library, than any other, it is because I am inclined to enable the learned men of that University to compare my extracts together. I even desire them very humbly to comply with my notions, to the end that they may be convinced of the truth of my assertion, and hope they will agree with me that this manuscript, as well as the others you find so ancient and estimable, if

they are willing to give themselves the trouble of examining them,—I say they are not sufficient for correcting the printed Text.

I am sure, Sir, you cannot be much pleased with these particulars, I wish with all my heart I could have spared them; but you have laid a constraint on me to display myself on this subject. Pray grant me a moment's audience more on the Samaritan Text of the Polyglot, on which you lay claim to correct the printed Text, and then I finish.

I have had the patience of collating the whole Genesis of it. Do you know what I have found in it? 1. About 700 variations, some of them make no sense at all, and others are of no language. Here I lay down some of them.

#### EXAMPLES.

#### GENESIS, CHAP. III.

The printed Hebrew Text.	The Samaritan Text of the Polyglot.
--------------------------	-------------------------------------

<p><i>beshearenee</i>          ver. 12. דָּשִׁינִי has          seduced me.</p>	<p>דָּשִׁינִי seems to be          Hebrew, but it is          indecent to explain          it. Vid. שִׁי (Sheen)</p>
---	--

Note, The same lectures are found in the Manuscript of *Morin*.

EXAM-

## EXAMPLES.

## GENESIS, CHAP. III.

The Hebrew printed Text. | The Samaritan Text of the Poliglot.

*cothenothe*

21. כתנות coats.

כיתנות No Hebrew.

*tob*

22. טוב the good.

*topr*

טור row. Vide

Exod. xxviii. 17.

GEN. vii. 12.

*hawgasham vauibe*

ויהי הגשם and the rain fell down.

*haugasham*

ויהי הגשם instead of

the word ויהי [*vau-  
ihe*] he put ויהי  
which is of no lan-  
guage; and in ver.

17, he has put also

ויהי instead of ויהי

בראשון Bad Hebrew.

Sic Manuscript of  
Morin.

GEN. viii. 13.

*baureeshone*

בראשון the first.

*vaukoreph.*

22. וחרף and winter.

וחרף signifies nothing.

CHAP. xii. 2.

*vabawiaaw*

והיה and it shall  
come to pass.

*vabowbe*

(Sic xvii. 1.) והוי and  
alas!

## GENESIS, CHAP. XII.

The printed Hebrew  
Text.*auth*

11. אתה thou.

*iakawyou vaowthauk*12. ואתך יחי and they  
shall keep thee  
alive.

CHAP. xiii. 6.

*iaukedawf*

יחדיו together.

CHAP. xvi. 8.

*mezay a*מזה אי from whence  
from what place.*phayra*12. פרא fierce, or sa-  
vage.

CHAP. xix. 29.

*hawhawphakaw*

ההפכה overthrowing

The Samaritan Text  
of the Polliglot.*bathe or owthee*

אתי me or with me.

*cakawyou*12. ואותך ידיו instead  
of the word ואתך  
he has put ואתי  
that is of no lan-  
guage. Sic Ma-  
nuscript of Morin.*iakaroo*ידיו they will be  
consumed, or  
burned. Vide  
Ezek. xxiv. 10.*mezay obe*מזה אי alas! from  
hence. Sic Ma-  
nuscript of Morin.*pharee*

פרי fruit.

האפכה signifies no-  
thing.

## GENESIS, CHAP. XX. 15.

The printed Hebrew Text.	The Samaritan Text of the Poliglot.
-----------------------------	--

*nawbow*

<i>nawbow</i> נבוא we will come.	נברה signifies nothing
-------------------------------------	------------------------

*lawk*

16. לך for thee, or to thee.	ליך <i>idem.</i>
---------------------------------	------------------

CHAP. XXI. 17.

*lawk marw*

מה לך what ails thee?	מליך <i>idem</i>
-----------------------	------------------

CHAP. XXII. 2.

*iakeidkaw*

יחידך thy only one.	יחידאך <i>idem.</i>
---------------------	---------------------

Instead of the word  
of the Hebrew  
Text, he puts  
יחידאך which sig-  
nifies nothing, and  
afterwards he adds  
ממני of me, which  
is a very curious  
addition.

<i>mangawkaw vaath</i> ואת מעכה	<i>mangawkaw awath</i> האת מעכה
------------------------------------	------------------------------------

24. and Maacha.	the sign. Maacha.
--------------------	----------------------

## GENESIS. CHAP. XXIII. 5.

The printed Hebrew Text.	The Samaritan Text of the Poliglot.
-----------------------------	--

*low lamore*

לו לאמר לו saying to  
him, or answer-  
ing him.

*bawa*

18. בא who came  
into.

CHAP. XXIV. 17.

*bawgmehenee*

הגמ'אני give me to  
drink.

*mistbaua*

21. משתאה consider-  
ing with astonish-  
ment.

CHAP. XXV. 23.

*babeatneck*

בבטן in thy womb.

*bawlgneetainee*

30. הע'טני let me eat

*low lamore*

לו לאמר לא saying not,

*bawnga*

בע' in the grave, or  
in the deep. See  
Job. xxx. 24. If.  
xvii. 1. &c.

הגמ'ני no Hebrew.

*mistba*

משתה a feast. Vide  
Gen. xix. 3.

*babeatnawek*

בבטני in thy wombs  
[the wombs of  
Rebekah.]

הע'לטני no Hebrew.

## GENESIS, CHAP. XXV.

The printed Hebrew Text.	The Samaritan Text of the Poliglot.
-----------------------------	--

*hawbakoraw*

34. הבכרה the birth- right.	הבכבה no Hebrew.
--------------------------------	------------------

CHAP. XXvii. 19.

*shabaraw*

שבה sit down.

*shabong*שבע seven [or satif-  
fied.]*vawiwngafs*

31. ויעש and he dressed.	ויעס signifies nothing
-----------------------------	------------------------

2d. [and which is more remarkable]  
Two Rabbinical words ; viz. Gen. xv. 10.  
בתור instead of בתוך and רבי instead of  
רבה and a Chaldee word chap. xvi. 16.  
את instead of ית.

3d. There are about 95 proper names  
of persons and places that have never ex-  
isted, and are not mentioned in any trans-  
lation of the Bible. Here follow some of  
them.

## EXAMPLES.

## GENESIS. CHAP. X.

The printed Hebrew Text.	The Samaritan Text of the Poliglot.
-----------------------------	--

2. מישך Mesech.

מושוק Mushuk.

GENE-

## GENESIS, CHAP. X.

The printed Hebrew Text.

4. אלישה Elisha.

10. כלנה Kalne.

23. לודים Ludim.

id. עוז Us.

id. כול Chul.

CHAP. xi.

17. פלג Phaleg.

29. 2d אברם Abram.

CHAP. xiii. 3.

2d בית אל Beth-el.

Note, It must be observed that this last proper name is in two words, signifying, *the House of God.*

id. 8. אברם Abram.

CHAP. xiv. 6.

פארן Paran.

24. ענר Gnaner.

CHAP. xxv. 3.

לטושם Latufim.

The Samaritan Text of the Poliglot.

אליש Alish

כלח Kalhen.

להדים Lakedim.

חוז Chus.

חוייל Chavil.

פבג Phabeg.

אררם Arram.

בת אל Bath-el.

Note, Here it signifies *the Daughter of God.*

אבם Abbam [see higher]

פראן Phran [sic Morin.]

ענרם Anram.

לטשאים Latsahim.

Note, The same names are found in the Morin's Manuscript.

## G E N E S I S.

The printed Hebrew Text.      The Samaritan Text  
of the Poliglot.

CHAP. xxxvi. 6.

יעקב Jacob.

יעקור Jangeor.

27. זען Zavan.

זען Zevangan.

CHAP. xlii. 36.

בנימין Benjamin.

בנימים Benjamim.

Sic chap. xliii. verse

14, 15, 16, 29, &

34. chap. xlv. 12.

chap. xlv. 12, and

14. Again chap.

xlvi. 19. and chap.

CHAP. xlv. 13.

xlix. 27.

פוא Phua.

פואה Phavaha.

21. אחי Echi.

אחים Achim.

This is not the whole ; I have confronted it with the Manuscript of Morin, which I only had two hours in my possession ; I have discovered among them a great conformity concerning the variations, and proper names.

Let us return a little while to the dates of your mss.

In the first place I maintain, that the greatest part of those which are met with there,

there, are false. As most part of those copies that appeared after the press, the Jews who have framed them, and have it a law to decieve the Christians, made no scruple at all to allow their work three, four, five, or six hundred years of antiquity. By your own confession of a place you quote (in Dissertation II. page 311) on account of a Manuscript that was put to auction at Amsterdam, in the last century. " You say, it had an inscription, and a date, declaring it to be written 300 years before Jesus Christ, and had nevertheless the Massoretical Notes on the margin." Your reflection is just on that Manuscript, the question is only to make an application of it to the others, You may be sure that if their dates do not offer so gross a contradiction, they are not less to be supposed as such, neither that a sensible writer would rather secure to himself 50 guineas profit, by giving only 500 years of antiquity to a manuscript he frames, than to run the risk of enjoying nothing at all, by dating it foolishly of twenty centuries.

2d. The greatest part of the manuscripts that are not dated, have the *Massoretical Notes* in the margin, under the figure of *Bear's*,

*Bears, Dogs,* and other animals the most singular, and you esteem them *as the best, and most ancient manuscripts.* You still may be in the right in this respect: But why do you endeavour (in Dissert. I. pag. 294) to disparage Athia's Editions, and ridicule that of Leusden, who declares to have laboured on the most ancient and correct manuscripts, *antiquissimis et accuratissimis,* and it is under this pretence they had in the margin the Great *Massora* transformed in the figure of *Bears, Dogs,* and other animals. Are you not sensible then of the contradiction of your words? Perhaps you imagine that those you make use of, are better, because instead of *Bears* and *Dogs,* &c. they bear the figures of *Adam* and *Eve;* the Devil, and all sorts of *amphibious.* Clear your mind from wrong notions. These sort of embellishments depend upon the caprice of the writer, or the taste of the age. Twenty years are only wanting to change the world in this respect; and that Copyist who had put in his first manuscript *Bears* and *Dogs,* perhaps has framed another, twenty years after where he did put some human figures, whether it be to send the buyer into another world, or to make

E people

people believe that they were more ancient than the others.

I only will quote one example of this last stroke. It is a Manuscript of the King's Library : a very ancient one as it is assured ; for they give it more than *six hundred years*. But who could attribute to the same so venerable an Epoch ? A Jew Merchant surely, who has sold it at first, or some other Hebrewist who did not know at all the Hebrew characters of different centuries. Indeed, in examining *myself*, those who have formed that volume, I discovered it to be the most modern of all ; and perhaps a hundred years after the *invention* of the Press. The most curious, and singular figures are really seen therein, and it has the Massoretical notes in the margin. It is likewise of the same time as the *most elegant and inestimable* manuscript of \*Aberdeen : for it has the same beauty, the same ornaments, nay, even the characters are the same. From whence I infer that they were both transcribed by the same person about the fifteenth century, and perhaps later.

Here is however, Sir, the soundest part  
of,

\* See the State of Collation 1761.

of your materials. Surely I have chosen those you ought to make a great esteem of, both by their antiquity, and the abode they inhabit.

By what fate should I not find two of them in the enormous list you offer (in Vol. II. of your Dissertation, p. 518, and the following) that might be as *correct* and *pure* as the printed Hebrew Text? This question appears to you a monstrous paradox. I will do my endeavour to explain it in the first post. For the present give me leave once more, that I may amuse myself a moment before the conclusion of this letter, on two variations, which you give in your first Dissertation, page 375, that you have extracted from two different Manuscripts of the *Bodleian Library*, to which you give so great encomiums in the same Dissertation, page 319, and the following. Here are your own words:

“ The Manuscript No. 2, has a remarkable difference in three words one after the other. I give the printed Text, and put under it the lesson of the Manuscript.

## GENESIS, CHAP. XXXVI.

## The Printed Text.

*aukieu Jangacob mepana arats ell vauialah Canai vaun baarats*

v. 6. בארץ כנען וילך אל ארץ מפני יעקב אחיו

## The Manuscript.

*Esau*

*Aram bepadan*

במקום ארם וילך אל ארץ מפני עשו אחיו

“ The history speaks here of Esau’s removal from the land of Canaan, in order to go to Mount Seir ; and this makes that the printed Text is the real lesson. What effort of genius !

“ In the printed Text of Exodus xiii. v. 2, we have the words באדם ובבהמה and the Manuscript No. 1. add after these words באדם ובבהמה

I do not perceive which are your motives to quote such variations : besides you spend to no purpose at all the time of the public by collating such titles, and of consequence lose yours with your arguments. We were sensible as well as you that in Genesis Chap. xxxvi. ver. 6, the question was about Esau’s departure from the land of Canaan to Mount Seir, and not that of Jacob from *Padan Aram* ; since at the beginning of the verse, Esau is precisely named, and it is inferred from  
your

your Manuscript that Esau withdrew from the presence of his brother Esau. Now, could you not be conscious that you dishonour your own Manuscripts by offering us your blunders, and the follies they contain? If it is to prove to us the inaccuracy of the Jew Copyists, commit then all your manuscripts to the flames, because they are all written by their own hands.

Another reflection. You make use of the Printed Text of *Vander Hooght* as well as a model to your work, as to collate all your Hebrew Manuscripts: Why don't you give the same lessons you find therein?

### EXAMPLES.

You say (in your first Dissertation, page 115) that in Ezekiel chap. xi. ver. 6. is the word חוצותיה: and *Vander Hooght's edition* puts חוצותיה.

In the page 167, 1 Chron. xi. 22, you put מקבצאל: and in *Vander Hooght's* is מן קבצאל

2 Sam. xxiii. 20, you put מן קבצאל and in *Vander Hooght* is מקבצאל

In page 192. 1 Chron. xi. 31. you put הפרעתוני: and in *Vander Hooght* is הפרעתני

In page 232, idem xi. 47, you put ועבר and in *Vander Hooght* is ועובר

In page 461. idem xviii. 16, you put סופר : and in *Vander Hooght* is ספר.

I am very sensible that the words above-mentioned are no faults, since they signify the same thing as in the Printed Text of *Vander Hooght*: But I offer them only to shew your little exactness: This however is one of the most necessary qualities you are not qualified with to complete your labours, yet it seems you make not much of it.

This is sufficient for to day, I shall have occasion to tell you more with the next post. Mean while,

I have the honor to be,

SIR,

Your's, &c.

LETTER

LETTER III.

SIR,

**I**N my preceding Letter I gave you only an extract of the insufficiency of your materials; though it be ever so light, yet I think to have displayed myself sufficiently in that respect, in order to shew what regard ought to be paid to it. However, if you were not satisfied, here I give you a challenge before the face of the whole world. Cause the best, and most ancient of your 400 manuscripts to be deposited in the hands of your Embassador, that is in our kingdom; and if I do not find, against one fault of the Printed Text whatever it be, that is neither marked with the Massoretical circle, nor corrected in the margin, or against a *good variation* of the said manuscript; I say, if I don't find therein *ten gross blunders* that shew an evident unskilfulness in the undertaker, I declare myself the greatest impostor, and the most impudent of all men. At this very moment I hang up these two qualities on my head,

which I only bind to a hair : cut it off if you dare.

Three kind of faults may be distinguished in a printed book, viz. those in the letters or characters that were made use of ; those committed against the language in which it was written ; and those against the sense it offers.

In order to correct the faults of the first species, good sense, and reason are required ; for substituting to the letter badly shaped, that, which ought to replace it.

The faults which are committed against the language are to be decided by those who possess grammar in the utmost perfection.

Lastly, he must thoroughly lay hold of the sense, who pretends to distinguish those faults which attack it.—Let us enter into the particulars of these principles, and make an application of them.

The Hebrew language is not of such a nature as the common Hebrewists imagine. Sublime in its ideas, simple in its descriptions ; sparkling in its expressions ; obscure by its genius ; rich in figures, and poor in terms : This is in a few words the true character of that language.

There are many who acknowledge the sublimity

sublimity of its ideas, admire the sparkling part of its expressions, and applaud the simplicity of its descriptions ; but there are very few who know to appraise the riches of its figures, pierce thro' the obscurity of its genius, and supply to the indigence of its terms. Must I be your teacher ? And must we not both blush ! I as a *Frenchman* to give you instructions, and you as an Englishman, to reduce you to the necessity of receiving them ?

I have told you, Sir, that three species of faults could be distinguished in a printed book, *viz.* errors in letters, against the language, and against the sense. I have added, that a little reason and common sense were required, in order to correct those faults of the first species. And indeed, if for instance it were as true as it is false that the printed Text imported, (Deut. xxii. 19,) as you are determined to make it believe \* נערה *which signifies nothing*, instead of נערה *a young girl, a damsel* ; and in 2 Sam. viii. 3. † דָּוִד *Davir* instead of דָּוִד *David* ; and thus some other letters, the resemblance whereof could equally deceive both the printer, and reviser ; these slight errors would not prejudice in the least the goodness

\* Dissert. page 415.

† Idem page 461.

goodness of the book; because they are corrected at the same time by the identical person who reads them. Moreover, I say, that a word is often read such as it should be, without perceiving any error in it; and besides, there is not a book, tho' ever so perfect, but some faults are found therein. Your own work is not exempted from them.

But the same does not happen with those that are against the language. In order to know them, grammar must be radically known; and the Hebrew grammar is, I dare say, the most difficult of all to be possessed in that perfection. Independently of the peculiar genius that characterises it, the principles thereof are quite opposite to those of our Western languages, and a singular study is required for the unravelling of them.

This language is, like the others, composed of Verbs, Adverbs, Nouns, and Pronouns. Give me leave to give you a sketch of these four different parts of speech. I will not be prolix on this head, but will only quote to you one or two examples of each proposition I have a mind to set forth.

Hebrew verbs are commonly composed of three radical letters only. They

They have four active conjugations: the first is simple, and is called *Kal*, that is to say light, and only offers to the mind a simple idea, which is divested from any circumstance of the action it signifies. Example, **פָּקַד** *he has visited.*

The second is called *Pibel*, and is distinguished by the duplicate of the second radical, which is expressed by a point put in the middle; and then it signifies an increase or multiplicity of action. Example, **פָּקַד** *he has frequently visited.*

The third is called *Hipbil*, and this is known by an ה which is put before the three radicals, and then it offers to the mind a transient idea. Example, **הִפְקִיד** *he has caused, he has permitted, he has commanded, &c. to visit.*

The fourth and last is called *Hitphael*, and is known by the two letters ה and ת which are put before the three radicals; and then as it not only partakes of the second conjugation of which it borrows the point of the second radical letter that signifies multiplicity, but also of the third of which it likewise takes the ה which imparts the transient idea to it, it ought to be expressed in consequence of these two ideas. Example, **הִתְפַּקַּד** *he has permitted, he has commanded,*

*commanded, &c. that one should frequently visit.*

Unless the Verb be susceptible of a reciprocal idea, that is, that the substantive that governs it be an inanimate being, capable of imparting a modification to himself, then the power of the verb ought to be expressed relatively to that modification. Example, תהלל *he does not cease praising himself*, חתחול *feign to be dangerously ill in the speediest manner*. Our dictionaries have not sufficiently distinguished the energy of these conjugations : there is often no more force given to the second than the first, and thus they are satisfied of admitting in the fourth conjugation the reciprocal idea, without mentioning the augmentative.

The Hebrew language has few adverbs ; however they are supplied when occasion requires with four letters, which grammarians call paragogical letters, namely, ׀ *a*, ׀ *vaw*, ׀ *jod*, and ׀ *noon*. They are always put at the end of words, and serve to indicate the augmentative or diminutive idea which the writer would apply to them.

It has its particles, conjunctions, and prepositions.

The nouns of that language have a masculine

culine and feminine gender, but have no neuter. However, in order to express them, the feminine gender is commonly made use of, and sometimes the masculine. They have no cases, but are commonly preceded by particles that represent them.

With respect to pronouns there are two species ; 1. separable, which form a word by themselves, and they are personal, or relatives; and 2, inseparable, which make part of the words to which they are joined. They are divided into two sorts, namely, in *affixes* which are put at the end of words, and *prefixes* that are put at the beginning of them.

If the knowledge of conjugating verbs, that of adverbs, the understanding of nouns, and the expressing of pronouns, were only required to be reputed an adept in the Hebrew language, and thus to have a right of touching the text of the holy scriptures ; a scholar of one year's instruction could aim at that honor. But these general notions are only an imperfect collection (altho' necessary) of materials that ought to be employed. One must thoroughly know the genius of the language, study its peculiarities, unravel its figures, and especially be very careful not to con-  
found

found the Hebrewisms, with the faults that crept into it. What would you say of a man who having never learned to draw, nor the mixture of colours, but knowing only in general what is required to paint, should join the pencils together, grind the colours, stretch out a cloth, fit himself with a pallet, not only with a phantastical design of making a picture, but even to criticise *Michael Angelo*, *Veronese*, *Rubens*, the *Titian*, and the most famous painters of the universe? You would look on this undertaking as a great extravagance, and would be in the right on it. Well, I say as much of a man who only knowing Hebrew superficially, would compose a book in that language, not only declaring his work as a masterpiece, but carry his temerity so far as to ridicule the only book we have in that language. I am going to give this mortal whoever he be, some examples of the peculiarity and genius of the Hebrew idioms: let us therefore begin by the verbs.

#### Hebraisms in the Verbs.

I have said there are four conjugations, the first thereof is simple, and the third offers to the mind a transient idea. The sacred language finds no difficulty in making

ing use of the one for the other: sometimes it employs the first for the third.

#### EXAMPLES.

In the fifth verse of Psalm lxxxi. the Lord takes the word, and says שָׁפַת לֹא יָדַעְתִּי אִשְׁמַע where I heard a language that I understood not, for *where I will cause to bear a language that I have not yet caused to understand.*

In Jeremiah chap. ix. verse 18. the simple verb עָזַבְנוּ *we abandon, forsake, or leave,* is employed for Hiphil, *we are forced to abandon.*

The preter tense is often put instead of the future, and this instead of the preter tense.

I give no examples, because it suffices to open the Bible to find them.

The verb is often in the singular when the nominative is in the plural.

#### EXAMPLES.

In Job. xii. 7. שֶׁאֵל נֹא בְהֵמוֹת וְתִרְדּוּ but ask now the beasts and he shall teach thee, instead of *they shall teach thee.*

In Genesis xxxv. 26. אֵלֶּה בְּנֵי יַעֲקֹב אֲשֶׁר יָלַד לוֹ these are the sons of Jacob *which was born to him,* instead of *which were born to him.*

The

The verb is sometimes in the plural, and the nominative in the singular.

#### EXAMPLES.

In Exodus, i. 10. **כִּי תִקְרָאנָה מִלְחָמָה** when there *fall* out any war, instead of *falleth*.

Prov. xxviii. 1. **נָסוּ וְאִין רִדְף רָשָׁע** the wicked *flee*, instead of *flees*, when no man pursueth.

The verb is often in the feminine, and the substantive in the masculine.

#### EXAMPLES.

Genesis xlix. 6. **אֵל תַּחַד כְּבוֹדִי** *into their assembly mine honor be not thou united*. The substantive **כְּבוֹד** is masculine, and the verb **תַּחַד** is feminine.

The verb is often understood.

#### EXAMPLES.

2. Sam. xxiii. 17. **דָּם הָאֲנָשִׁים הָהֵלֶכִים** *is not this the blood of the men that went in jeopardy of their lives by such an expedition, instead of shall I drink the blood of the men? &c.*

Psalms iv. 2. **עַד מָה כְּבוֹדִי לִכְלָמָה** *how long will ye turn my glory into shame? instead of, until when shall ye turn my glory, &c.*

The verb passes often from one person to another in the same phrase, without any thing declaring so sudden an alteration.

#### EXAM-

## EXAMPLES.

Jerem. xxix. 19. שלחתי אליהם את עבדי *which I sent them by my servants the prophets, but ye would not hear.*

Genes. xlix. 4. כי עלית משכבי אבך אז *because thou wentest up to thy Father's bed: then defiledst thou it, he went up to my couch.*

## Hebraisms in Adverbs.

The Adverb is often repeated twice, and then it offers to the mind a new force in the idea.

## EXAMPLES.

Deut. xxviii. 43. יעלה עליך מעלה מעלה *ascendit super te supra supra, shall get up above thee very high, i. e. he shall become thine master.*

וְאַתָּה תֵרֵד מְטָה מְטָה *et tu descendes infra infra: and thou shalt come down very low, i. e. thou shalt become his slave.* This Hebraism is very common.

The adverb often fixes a time, although it be undetermined.

## EXAMPLES.

Isaiah xxx. 33. כי ערוך מאתמול תפתה *for Tophet is ordained of old, instead of a long while.*

F

2 Sam.

2 Sam. xv. 2c. תָּמוּל בּוֹאֵךְ thou camest but *yesterday*, instead of it is *not long since*.

The adverb offers often a comparison, and it is an affirmation.

### EXAMPLES.

Job. xxiv. 14. לְאוֹר יָקוֹם רֹצֵחַ... וּבַלַּיְלָהּ יִהְיֶה the murderer rising with the light, --and in the night *is as a thief*, instead of *he becomes a thief*.

Psalms cxxii. 3. יְרוּשָׁלַם הַבְנוּיָה כְּעִיר Je-  
rusalem builded *as a city*, &c. instead of  
Jerusalem builded *shall be a city*, &c.

On the contrary, the comparative adverb is often understood.

### EXAMPLES.

Exod. xix. 4. וְאַשָׁא אֶתְכֶם עַל כְּנָפֵי נְשָׁרִים and how I bare you, (from Egypt) on eagle's wings, instead of *as on eagle's wings*.

Psalms cxxv. 2. יְרוּשָׁלַם הָרִים סָבִיב לֵה וְה' the mountains are round about Jerusalem, and the Lord is round about his people, instead of *as Jerusalem*, and *so the Lord*, &c.

The comparative adverb seems to be employed without necessity, and forms a pleonasm.

### EXAMPLES.

Pf. xlix. 12. נִמְשַׁל כְּבֵהֶמוֹת נִדְמוּ he is like the beasts that perish, instead of *he is a beast that perisheth*. Job.

Job. xxx. 19. וְאֶדְוַמְשָׁל כַּעֲפָר וְאֶפֶר he has cast me into the mire, and I am become like dust and ashes, instead of *I am become dust and ashes.*

### Hebraisms in the Nouns.

The Substantive is often repeated twice.

#### EXAMPLES.

Deut. xvi. 20. צֶדֶק צֶדֶק תִּרְדֹּף *seclaberis justitiam*, that which is altogether just, shalt thou follow, i. e. *thou shalt follow* an exact justice.

Jerem. iv. 19. אֲחִילָה *visceribus meis, visceribus meis doleo*. My bowels, my bowels, I am pained at my very heart, i. e. there is not one part of my heart but pains me.

The substantive is often wanting, and it is understood.

#### EXAMPLES.

Genesis xlii. 30. דָּבַר הָאִישׁ אֶרְנִי הָאָרֶץ *locus est vir dominus, terræ nobis dura verba*. The man who is the Lord of the land spake roughly to us, i. e. (hard words.)

Isaiah xxx. 16. וְעַל קֵל נִרְכָּב *et super levem equitabimus*. And we will ride upon the swift (*horse*.)

The Adjective is often understood.

EXAMPLES.

Genesis xxxvi. 6. וילך אל ארץ *et abiit in terram* [subauditur alienam] And he went (*Esau*) into (*another*) country.

Prov. xviii. 21. מצא אשה מצא טוב *qui invenit mulierem* (*bonam*) *invenit bonam*. Whofo finds a (*good*) wife, findeth a good thing.

The Substantive is often employed instead of the Adjective.

EXAMPLES.

Genesis xli. 34. תועבת מצרים כל רעה *abominationes Ægyptiorum omnis pastor gregis*: for every shepherd is *an abomination* unto the Egyptians, instead of *is abominable* to the Egyptians.

Solomon's Songs, i. 17. קרות בחינו *ligna domorum nostrum cedri saquearia nostra abietes*. The beams of our houses are cedar, and our rafters of fir; instead of *cedar and fir wood*.

An Adjective singular is often joined to a Substantive plural.

EXAMPLES.

Genesis xlvii. 3. רעה צאן עבדך *pastor ovium servi tui*. Thy servants are *shepherd*, instead of *shepherds*.

Isaiah

Isaiah xvi. 18. שדמות השבון אמלל *arva Hesebonis languidum*. The fields of Hesebon *languishes*, instead of *languish*.

The Feminine is often used instead of the Neuter.

#### EXAMPLES.

Genesis 1. 20. ואתם חשבתם עלי רעה *vos cogitastis malam, contra me Deus cogitavit bonam*.

Psalms xxvii. אחת שאלתי.. אותה אבקש *unam postulavi hanc requiram*, instead of *unum* and *hoc*. The masculine is used for the same thing: the examples thereof are very frequent.

The Singular is often put instead of the Plural.

#### EXAMPLES.

Genesis xlix. 6. הרגו איש... עקרו שור *occiderunt virum suffoderunt muram*. They slew a *man*—they digged down a *wall*, instead of *men* and *walls*.

Levit. xi. 2. זאת החיה אשר תאכלו *hec est bestia quam manducabitis*. This is the *beast* which ye shall eat, instead of *these are the beasts*, &c.

And the Plural instead of the Singular.

#### EXAMPLES.

Genesis xix. 2. הכו בסנורים *percusserunt cæcitatibus*. They smote *with blindnesses*,

F 3

instead

instead of *with blindness*. This Hebraism is very frequent; and it is made use of to express the *greatness* or the *power* of the subject.

Often from two Substantives divided by the Conjunction (ו) (et) the second ought to be rendered by the Genitive Case.

#### EXAMPLES.

Genesis iii. 16. ארבה עצבונך והרנך *multiplicabo dolorem tuum et conceptum tuum*. I will greatly multiply *thy sorrow and thy conception*, instead of, I will greatly multiply *the sorrow of thy conception*.

Jeremiah xxxvi. 27. אשרף המלך את המגלה ואת הדברים *combussit rex volumen, et verba*. The king had burned *the roll and the words*, instead of *the roll of the words*.

There is often an inversion in the two Substantives.

#### EXAMPLES.

Joshua ii. 6. ותטמנם בפשתי העץ *et abscondet eos sub linis ligni*. And she hid them *with flaxen of stalk*, instead of *with stalks of flax*.

Prov. xxvi. 23. כסף סיגים *argentum scoriarum*, instead of *scoriæ argenti*, with the *silver of the dross*, instead of *with silver dross*.

The

The Substantive is often employed instead of the Adverb.

EXAMPLES.

Psalms lxxv. 3. אני מישרים אשפט *ego recta judicabo*. I will judge *the uprightness*, instead of *uprightly*.

Prov. xxxi. שפת צדק *judica justitiam*. Judge *the right*, instead of *judge righteously*.

The absolute form is often employed instead of the construed.

EXAMPLES.

1 Kings xxii. 27. ומים לחץ *et aquas angustiae*, and waters of affliction, instead of מי לחץ

2 Kings, iii. 4. ומאה אלף אילים צמר *et centum mille arietum lanæ*, and an hundred thousand rams *with the wool*, instead of אילי צמר

And the construed instead of the absolute.

EXAMPLES.

Numb. v. 18. מי המרים *aqua amara*, the bitter water, instead of מים המרים

Isaiah xxxiii. 6. חכמת ודעת *sapientia & scientia*, the wisdom, and science of חכמה.

Hebraisms in Pronouns.

The Pronoun Demonstrative often takes place of the Substantive.

EXAMPLES.

Pfalm cxiv. 2. היתה יהודה לקדשו ישראל. *Judah was his sanctuary (and) Israel his dominion; i. e. the sanctuary and the dominion of the Lord.*

Esther ix. 25. ובכאה לפני המלך. *And when she came before the king [i. e. Esther.]*

The Substantive is often repeated instead of the Pronoun.

EXAMPLES.

Gen. xii. 5. ויצאו ללכת ארצה כנען ויבאו. *and they went forth to go into the land of Canaan, and into the land of Canaan they came, instead of into that land.*

Pfalm xxv. 9. ידרך ענוים במשפט וילמד ענוים דרכו. *The meek will he guide in judgment: and the meek will he teach his way, instead of he will teach them, &c.*

The Demonstrative is often put instead of the Relative.

EXAMPLES.

Pfalm civ. 8. אל מקום זה יסדת להם. *to that place thou hast founded for them, instead of to the place which thou hast founded for them.*

Pfalm

Psalms cxlii. 3. בארְחוֹן אֹהֶלךָ טִמְנּוּ פֶּחַ לִי. *in that way I walked have they privily laid a snare for me, instead of, in the way wherein I walked.*

The Pronoun is often of the masculine gender, whilst its Substantive is of the feminine.

#### EXAMPLES.

Exod. xi. 6. וְהִיתָה צַעֲקָה גְדוֹלָה בְּכָל אֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם אֲשֶׁר כָּמְדוּ לֹא נִהְיָתָה וְכָמְדוּ לֹא תִסָּף. *And there shall be a great cry throughout all the land of Egypt, such as there was none like it, nor shall be like it any more: the word cry is feminine in Hebrew, and the pronoun is in the masculine gender.*

Jud. xix. 24. הִנֵּה בְתִי הַבְּתוּלָה וּפִילְגֶּשְׁתָּהּ. Behold (here) my daughter a maiden, and his concubine, *them* I will bring out now. The pronoun *them* is in this verse repeated *thrice* in the masculine gender.

The Pronoun often differs in number with its Substantive.

#### EXAMPLES

Joshua ii. 4. וַתִּקַּח הָאִשָּׁה אֶת שְׁנֵי הָאֲנָשִׁים. *and the woman took the two men and bid him, instead of bid them.*

Psalms xxxv. 8. תְּבוֹאֵהוּ שׂוֹאָה. Let destruction come upon *him*, instead of upon *them*.

*them.* In this verse the Pronoun is *thrice* in the singular, although in the preceding verses the Substantives, and Verbs it governs, be in the plural.

The Pronoun Relatives *qui, quæ, quod*, is often understood.

#### EXAMPLES.

Gen. xxxix. 4. וכל יש לו נתן בידו *et omnia erant, sibi dedit in manu ejus*, instead of *quæ erant*. And all *that* he had he put into his hand.

Isaiah vi. 6. ובידו רצפה במלקחים לקח *et in manu ejus carbo inforcipidus tulerat desuper altare*. Having a live coal in his hand, *which* he had taken with the tongs from off the altar.

The Relative and Antecedent are often understood.

#### EXAMPLES.

Exod iv. 13. שלח נא ביד תשלח *mitte queso per manum mittes*. Send I pray thee, by the hand of *him whom* thou wilt send.

Prov. viii. 32. ואשרי דרכי ישמרו *et beati custodierent vias meas*, for blessed are they *that* keep my ways.

The Pronoun is often employed together with the Substantive.

#### EXAMPLES.

Genesis ii. 17. ומעץ הדעת טוב ורע לא תאכל

תאכל ממנו *et de arbore scientiæ boni & mali non comedes ex ea* : But of the tree of knowledge of good and evil thou shalt not eat of it. This Hebraism is very common, as well as the repetition of the pronoun with the relative *qui, quæ, quod, &c.* I think it would be lavishing away the time to no purpose to give some examples of them.

Besides these general Hebraisms, and many others that are obviously known, and constitute a part of the peculiarity of the language, there are four paralogical letters I did already mention, namely, the ה י and ך. They are used to give the names to which they are joined, an increment or decrement of power. I only will alledge one, or two examples of each.

The letter ה is joined to the Verb.

#### EXAMPLES.

Jeremiah iii. 25. נשכבה בבשתנו The verb שכב only signifies *jacere*; therefore if it is simply rendered by *jacemus*, the power which the prophet would give it by adding an ה to it, is not expressed, an adverb must then be joined, as *ignominiose*, or *turpiter*, or *triste jacemus in approbrio nostre*. We lie down in our shame, &c.

It is joined to Particles.

EXAMPLES.

## E X A M P L E S.

Lament. i. 1. אִכָּה must not be simply rendered by *quomodo*, how; because the particle אִי alone has that signification, but the ה which is joined to it, must be expressed, and translated *quo funesto caso*. By what dismal accident.

It is joined to the Affix Pronoun.

## E X A M P L E S.

Jeremiah vii. 27. וְלֹא יַעֲנוּכָה must not be simply translated, *but they will not answer thee*; but in order to express the ה we must translate thus, *they will not answer thy repeated cries*.

In vain does Robertson on this verse charge this ה with the faults of the copyist. I do not value that wise man at this decision. It is beyond doubt that this letter is here energetical as in many other verbs.

It is joined to Nouns.

## E X A M P L E.

יְשׁוּעָתָה *an intire deliverance*; אִמְתָּה *a terrible fright*; עֲזָרָתָה *a quick succor*.

Lastly upon the whole, the ה is never useless. It is an affix, it is either energetical, or local. If it is a prefix it is either demonstrative or interrogative, and often

ten energetical, especially if it comes before a pronoun.

The letter ך is likewise energetical ; it is commonly put at the end of Nouns, Pronouns, and Particles.

#### EXAMPLES.

Psalms ii. 3. ננתקה את מוסדותימו ונשליכה ממנו עבותמו in this passage the two verbs have each an ה, and each substantive has an energetical ך. They must then be expressed according to the idea of the Psalmist, *let us break with eclat their bands asunder*, and cast away with scorn their cords from us, or their heavy yoke.

Psalms l. 10. חיתו יער the *wild* beast of the forest.

Psalms xx. 2. פרימו מארץ תאבר their *impious* fruit shalt thou destroy from the earth.

Psalms ii. 4. אדני ילעג למו the Lord shall have (those fools) them in derision.

Id. 5. אז ידבר אלימו then shall he speak unto them (those rebels.)

Psalms xvii. 10. פימו דברו בגאות with their *impious* mouth they speak proudly.

Exod. xv. 5. כמו אבן as *rapidly* as a stone.

Psalms lviii. 5. כמו פתן (their poison is) as *dangerous* as the poison of a serpent. The

The letter ' has the same quality; it is joined to Nouns.

#### EXAMPLES.

Psalms cx. 4. על דברתי מלכי צדק after the (*excellent*) order of Melchizedek.

Lament. i. 1. עם רבתי that was full of people which *swarms* with inhabitants.

Ibid. רבתי בנוים she that was great among the nations, or *the most plentiful*.

Ibid. שרתי במדינות and the Princess among the provinces, or the most independent sovereign, &c.

#### To Verbs.

#### EXAMPLES.

ושמת קרית Ruth iii. 3. שמת קרית and put thy raiment upon thee, or put *carefully* thy *finest* raiments. upon thee, וירדת הנרן וירדת קרית and get thee down secretly to the floor.

ושכבת קרית Ruth iii. 4. שכבת קרית And thou shalt uncover his feet, and lay thee down: or thou shalt uncover (the bed) at the feet side, and lay thee down without making a noise; (or rather) quite dressed.

To

## To Participles.

Genesis xlix. 2. עִירָה לִגְפִי אֶמְדִּי binding his sole unto the wine ; or binding *without fear*, &c.

Isaiah xxii. 16. חֲקִקִי בְּסֹלֶעַ מִשְׁכֵּן לוֹ that graveth an habitation for himself in a rock, or, that graveth usefess, &c.

Jeremiah x. 17. יוֹשְׁבֹתַי בְּמִצּוֹר. יוֹשֶׁבֶת קִרְיָהּ inhabitant of the fortress ; or, *confident inhabitant*, &c.

Lastly, the ׀ is put at the end of verbs, and is made use of to encrease or diminish the power of them.

Isaiah xiii. 8. יְחִילוֹן pangs and sorrows shall take hold of them ; or the *liveliest pangs*, &c.

Psaln lix. 16. יָנוּעוֹן and go יָנוּעוֹן קִרְיָהּ round about the city.

Chap. xi. verse 7, of Genesis, furnishes us with a striking example of this kind of Hebraism. The Lord expressively defends *Adam* to touch the tree of knowledge of good and evil ; and if in case you should transgress this command, says he to him מוֹת תָּמוּת thou shalt die of death, (which is another Hebraism, signifying, thou shalt surely die.) What answer does the woman give to the devil, who made her an

an insidious question? We may, says she, eat from all the fruits of the garden; however the Lord has bid us not to touch that, which is in the midst of the garden, *פִּן תָּמוּתוֹן* *lest ye die*. It is easily perceived, that Eve at the eve of her fall, endeavours to diminish the force of the expressions wherein her decree was pronounced, by making use of the particle *פִּן* *ne fortè*, and of a diminutive *ן*. On the contrary, the devil secures her by an expression that contains two Hebraisms, *i. e.* the repetition of the word, and the energetical letter *תָּמוּתוֹן* *לא מוֹת* No, no, *most certainly*, ye shall not die!

Let us go over to the Particles, for they are worthy some attention.

#### Of Particles.

Under this general appellation I understand the *Prepositions*, *Conjunctions*, *Interjections*, and even *some Adverbs*.

They are either simple, as *אֵת* and *כִּי* or compound, as *מֵאֵת* and *כִּכֵּה*.

The most common among the simple, are the *ו* and *כִּי* which our versions commonly render by *et* and *quia*; however, they often have another signification.

The *ו* often comprehends a consequent idea.

E X A M-

## EXAMPLES.

Eccles. ii. 26. נתן חכמה ודעת ושמחה *he gives to a man that is good in his sight, wisdom, and knowledge, and joy, i. e. wisdom, and knowledge, the sources of true delights.*

It is rendered by an adverb of time, when it comes before some particles, which stand for hypothetical, or periodical conjunctions.

## EXAMPLES.

Jeremiah vii. 5. כי אם היטיב תיטבו *את־דרךכם.*

Verse 7. ושכנתי אתכם *For if you thoroughly amend your ways, then will I cause you to dwell, &c.*

It is often an alternative Conjunction.

Jerem. xvii. 25. רכבים בדרכב ובסוסים *riding in chariots and on horses : if they like better they may translate it, the one dragged in chariots ; the other riding on their horses.*

It is sometimes suppressed in the text.

## EXAMPLES.

Eccles. ix. 15. ומצא בה איש מסכן חכם *Now there was found in it a poor wise man : or in those circumstances there was found a poor man, but a wise one.*

Jeremiah vii. 24. וילכו במועצות בשררות לבם הרע *but walked in the counsels, and in the imagination of their evil heart.*

In order to say the whole in a word concerning the ך and ך׳ we may, and ought to give them the signification that the sense requires, together with the connection of thoughts, and nature of the idiom in which the Hebrew language is translated.

There are other particles to which our dictionaries only give one signification, or two at most, and in certain places neither of them often offer a lawful sense. In this case neither the ignorance of the copyist, nor that of the printer, is to be taxed, but only the barrenness of dictionaries; and then we must recur to a certain principle. Hence it is, that whenever the common signification cannot be adapted to the sense of the text, or is badly adapted to it, we ought to examine the relations of that particle, with the others that are found in the same verse; whereby its true signification is infallibly found.

#### EXAMPLES.

Ecles. ii. 16, imports ואין ימות ההפס עם ההפסיל. We look for אין, and the only signification we find of it is *quomodo* and *ubinam*

*ubinam* interrogatives *how? where then?*

As we can make no use neither of the one nor of the other, and it being a nonsense to ask *how* nor *where then* shall the wise man die with the fool? We made use of the principle, and find that 7<sup>N</sup> has a relation with 5<sup>V</sup>; and this very relation visibly shews that that particle must here signify *similiter, pariter, likewise, equally*: The wise man with the fool shall die likewise; or, and how dies the wise *man*? as the fool.

I shall beware myself from giving you here a review of all the simple particles; the principles I have just stated for the 7 and 7<sup>N</sup> are applicable to all those which have not a *fixt, invariable, and determined* signification; and there are very few of this last species.

#### Of compound Particles.

They have more force than the simple; and although dictionaries confound them commonly under the same signification; yet it is not less evident that the energy which offers the letter ought to be expressed, and sometimes the syllable which is joined to the simple word also. I will only quote one single example, for I would not fatigue you too much.

The adverb יחד signifies *una simul, together*. Now in many places of the holy scriptures it is met with the compound, thus יחדו and notwithstanding that, the same signification is always given to it without minding the encrease of the ו. This is a blameable neglect. It must be known that the Hebrew language is not ornamented with useless letters, nor syllables, and they shall never come near, in a translation, to the force, majesty, and nervous expressions of the Hebrew text, unless the greatest care be taken in expressing those sort of letters.

#### EXAMPLES.

Jeremiah v. 5. יחדו שברו עול These words ought not to be rendered simply by *simul confregerunt jugum, but these have altogether broken the yoke*. This is enervating the prophet's thought. It must be translated *unanimi impetu; with a common effort*.

Hosea ii. 2. ונקבצו יחדו *et congregabuntur unanimus*; and they will gather together, in a perfect union.

The same is to be understood of מרוע מכלי מאת מאין, &c. and from all other compound particles, the greatest part whereof comprehends a modificative idea,

idea, which only can be rendered by a substantive or an adjective.

I confine myself to that light sketch of Hebraisms, which is sufficient to make any impartial person interview how the genius of that language is different from that of our Western languages. But if this knowledge is absolutely necessary for not taking Hebraisms as faults of our language, it does not almost suffice to decide of those which are imagined to be against the sense. I have but a few words to say against this third species of faults.

Many things are wanting to discover the true sense of a difficult passage : independently of the knowledge of Hebraisms, on which the eyes ought always to be fixed, in order to make an application in time and place, it is yet indispensable to know, and radically possess the three principal styles of the holy scriptures ; namely, the historical, moral, and prophetical, and especially not to confound the sense of the letter, with the literal sense. As you are very possibly ignorant of this distinction, I will give you a hint of it ; for I would not have you accuse me of amusing you with an unintelligible language.

The sense of the letter is nothing else

than the sense of the expressions grammatically taken, and in their natural signification. For instance פרות signifies *Kine*. This is the sense of the letter; and this expression by reading it does not convey to my idea but that of *Kine*.

The literal sense is the thought which is involved under the sense of the letter. For instance, Amos begins thus his fourth chapter, שמעו הדבר הזה פרות הבשן *hear this word ye kine of Basshan, or fat kine*.

Surely the Prophet does not address his speech to *kines*, he does it to beings capable of understanding his words. Now those beings designed under the appellation of *kines* must be found; the description whereof constitutes the literal sense.

Hear this word ye *fat kine*; this is the sense of the letter. Hear this word *insolent and voluptuous* princes of Samaria; this is the literal sense.

This word raises in my mind a reflection which I must impart to you; perhaps it will serve you for an amusement.

There is not absolutely a great difference between פרות *kine*, and פחות *princes*. Would there not have been some, who in your amazing manuscripts, might have imported this latter word? I know nothing

thing of it ; but let us suppose it for a moment. I immediately represent myself as a copyist of the last century ; or perhaps my cotemporary, who does his utmost endeavour to be expeditious in framing on the printed text, a very respectable manuscript for its antiquity. As he knows to read, write, and understands Hebrew indifferently, he finds in Amos : *Hear this word פְּרוֹת הַבָּשָׁן ye kine of Bashan*. He stops, reflects, and instantly concludes, that this cannot be : “ surely it is a fault, says “ he to himself ; but פְּרוֹת means *Princes*. “ Let us write it : it is more noble to address the word to the *Princes of Bashan* “ than to the kine of that country.” Thus פְּרוֹת is enregistered. (How many thousands of variations are of the same kind !)

I follow the steps of this manuscript, and see it some years after take its flight toward some famous library. It is received, and treated thither with a respect which is only due to a venerable old age. They have given it a date, and that is sufficient. At last they entrust some curious with it, that they may extract some variations from it. Here it is where my imagination forms a singular scene. I think to see *five or six waggish boys* round about their mas-

ter, comparing, by cursing and swearing, some old ragged copies with the Printed Text. One of them having my manuscript, falls upon Amos, and finds in his copy פָּחוֹת (*phachoth*) princes; and going back to the printed text, he reads there פָּרוֹת (*pharoth*) kine. Ah! master, he exclaims, what horror! The Hebrew Text imports *kine*. The old Hebrewist runs to it, turns his spying-glass, verifies by himself the two lessons, and applauds both the ignorance of his pupil, and that of the copyist. A variation of the *utmost consequence*! an acclamation of triumph; an *excommunication* of the printed text; a consecration *without reserve* to the manuscripts.—Don't you find my dreams very pleasant? Let us retake the thread of our discourse.

I therefore say, that, in order to discover the literal sense of the holy scriptures, the different styles in which it is written must be thoroughly known. There is none more obscure than the prophetic style; still in vain would be all endeavours to dissipate those obscurities, if the cause of them are not known: therefore we must begin by discovering them, and know

In

In the first place that the prophetical books are full of reticences, or ellipsis : namely, that there are thousand places where the phrases are not complete, and the translator is obliged to supply the verb, or expression that is wanting, in order to give the idea, which the prophet offers, all the conspicuousness it requires.

## E X A M P L E S.

Pfalm lxxv. ver. 7. **כִּי לֹא מִמּוּצָא וּמִמְעַרְב .**  
**וְלֹא מִמְדֵּבֶר הָרִים**

Verse 8. **כִּי אֱלֹקִים שֹׁפֵט**

Ver. 7. *For promotion cometh neither from the east, nor from the west, nor from the south.*

Ver. 8. *But God is the judge.*

Who is not conscious, that in the words of the 7th verse the sense is not complete ? Shall we therefore cry against the text as corrupted ? yea, *the ignorant*. But the *real* Hebrewist, who has applied himself to the prophetical stile, acknowledges, in the first twinkling of an eye, the reticence, or ellipsis, and looks for the supplement it requires. He goes not far, but finds it in the first words of the following verse. He takes the participle שֹׁפֵט (*judge*) and gives it a retro-active effect ; he refers and applies it to its phrase, that has no verb,  
 and

and translates it thus. "It is neither from the east, nor the west, nor the desert mountains, *that the judge* will come; it is the Lord, &c."

Here is another example which perhaps you will not be displeased to see.

Hosea in his first chapter relates the order which the Lord gave him in the following expressions :

Verse 2. ויאמר ה' אל הושע לך קח לך אשה וזנונים וילדי זנונים כי זנה תזנה הארץ מאחריה

word by word. *Et dixit Dominus ad oseam, vade accipe tibi uxorum fornicationum & filios fornicationum quia fornicando fornicatur terra de post Dominum.* And the Lord said to Hosea, go, and take unto thee a wife of *whoredoms*, and children of *whoredoms*; for the land hath committed great whoredoms departing from the Lord.

---What Hebraisms and obscurities !

Although an impious adept may pretend to prove, that the Lord not only permits, but still commands the contrary of his law, alledging this verse with confidence, and applauding himself already with his victory, he raises on this text a trophy to impiety and irreligion; yet the true Hebrewist is neither alarmed at the acclamations of triumph, nor the security of

of his antagonist, but attentively examines his text. He immediately recollects that the prophet scarce makes use of any other expressions to describe idolatry, than those of whoredom and adultery. This is a fact that cannot be denied.

This enigmatical expression thus being unravelled, begins to cast a thin ray of light on this verse; for it would be less repugnant to say, marry an idolatrous wife, and get from her idolatrous children, than to say, Marry a prostitute, and get from her children of prostitution. Why? Because by marrying an idolatrous woman, the children that are got from her, may become idolaters likewise; whereas by taking a lawful wife, even a prostitute, those children that are got from her are lawful, and can never be called, nor reputed children of prostitution: But in this explanation there remains still an insurmountable difficulty. It exists in the Mosaic law an express defence, not only to marry a prostitute (Lev. xxi. 7.) but also to contract any alliance with idolaters (Deut. vii. 3.) therefore the Lord cannot command his prophet neither the one nor the other: consequently this is not the true sense of the prophecy. Where shall we find then  
the

the unravelling of it? In the verse itself, by making the application of its principles.

Independently of a first reticence or ellipsis, which is between זִנְנוּ and לֵדִי that shews the conjunction ו and that good sense only dictates to be supplied by these words *procrea filios*, get children from her; he examines the remainder of the text. What does he find in the same? *quia fornicando fornicatur terra de post Dominum*. This double Hebraism of the repetition of the verb and compound particle does not stop him; as it is adapted to the prophetic stile, he renders the repetition of the verb by a circumstance (*is shamefully prostituted*) and the particle compound by a verb (*by quitting the Lord*.)

But all his attention is fixed on the word *earth*, which is shamefully prostituted, and argues thus: "My religion teaches  
" me that God cannot command that  
" which is contrary to his law. Com-  
" mon sense, and reason, shew me that  
" children born from a lawful marriage,  
" cannot be children of prostitution.  
" Therefore it is neither on the mother,  
" nor the children, that the infamy of this  
" epithet ought to fall. On whom shall  
" it then fall? On this earth, which for  
" prostitut-

“ prostituting herself to idols, quits the  
 “ covenant of the Lord. Now, if the  
 “ earth is the prostitute, as the prophet  
 “ himself declares, that woman he is go-  
 “ ing to marry by the order of the Lord,  
 “ is no more a prostitute, but a woman  
 “ of *the earth* of prostitutions; and the  
 “ children that will be born from her,  
 “ will be for the same reason, children  
 “ *born in the earth* of prostitutions; name-  
 “ ly, of idolatry.” There is nothing else  
 to be done, in order to give it a rational,  
 lawful, and orthodox sense, than to take  
 that expression *אֶרֶץ earth*, which is found  
 in the second part of the verse; and by  
 virtue of the rule of reticences, or ellipsis,  
 transfer it in the first part: This substan-  
 tive is to govern here.

Besides, the cause of such a command  
 ought to be examined. Ever since near  
 two centuries, the kingdom of Israel was  
 plunged into the most monstrous idolatry.  
 In order to withdraw them from it, the  
 Lord made them ever since a long while  
 the most terrible menaces: at last he made  
 use of Hosea for that purpose.---Go, says  
 he to him, take a wife of that abode of  
 idolatry, and beget children. The pro-  
 phet obeys, he marries, and gets chil-  
 dren;

dren ; but the Lord himself calls them : viz. one *לא רחמיה* *no more mercy :* and another *לא עמי* *you are no more my people.* Behold what was it the Lord aimed at ? it was to keep under the eyes of that ungrateful people, children whose names might be a proof, a remembrance, a perpetual and living monument of his indignation, and the misfortunes he was going to pour on them. This was the end of the marriage he commanded his prophet to contract. Was it necessary for that purpose that his prophet should marry a prostitute ? and is it not insulting the infinite holiness of the God we worship, to make him give his minister such a command ?

In this manner labours and reasons a Christian Hebrewist on the holy scriptures. Do you labour and reason in this manner ? This is a question I will incessantly examine.

2d, Every moment we find some vicissitudes, namely, a continual change of tenses, modes, conjugations, numbers, genders, and persons. I have given some examples of them in the Hebraisms of Verbs. Here, I will be satisfied to state an only principle that may lead us with security in the midst of the chaos that the change

change of tenses and modes cast in the prophetical books.

The object which the sacred writer has in view must be attentively examined ; if the matter in question refers to future events, the futures are left such as they are, and the preterits are changed into futures. If the question be concerning present events, the presents and futures are put in the present. At last, if the prophet relates past events, the preterits are left, and futures are substituted in their place. The whole depends on catching the literal sense.

3d, The whole is full of figurative expressions : namely, metaphorical, enigmatical, parabolical, and symbolical expressions, which form a thick cloud on the literal sense of prophecies. The first chapter of Ezekiel is a collection of symbolical expressions ; Habakuk's song is one of the enigmatical expressions. Shall we by looking for, or supposing, the faults of impression, find their sense in these chapters ? No, Sir, although you might consult *ten thousand* manuscripts, and refer two millions of variations, yet you would not spread more light on them. In order to explain them, knowledge is required ; a solid judgment, and free from all prejudice ;

dice ; a singular attention to examine whether those very figurative expressions are not employed some where else, and in what sense they are so used ; the art of combining the relations of those expressions to each other, and carry them all to a center. In short, the talent of appraising them, and applying each of them to the individual which the prophet has intended to design.---Do you think that this is learned by collating old ragged parchments ?

4th, There are general and undetermined words, which must be restrained to the species, and particular words that must be extended to the generality that the sense and connection of the thoughts require.

#### EXAMPLES.

Isaiah xiii. 2. ופקדתי על תבל רעה *And I will punish the world for their evil.* Will it be understood by this word *the world*, the whole world ? The Prophet only foretells the ruin of Babylon.

Zech. xi. 1. פתח לבנון דלתיו ואכל אש *Open thy doors, O Lebanon, that the fire may devour thy cedars.*

Who is not conscious that Lebanon is here a particular word, which must be extended

extended to the object of which the Prophet declares the deserter?

5th, It is very common to see in the prophetical writings a change of persons, without any thing, declaring it in the text; and this is still a figure that ought very cautiously to be minded, for fear of putting into the Lord's mouth that which the Prophet says, or that which say those to whom he addresses his speech & *vicissim*.

The second Psalm may be a proof of my assertion. There we see the church, the impious man, the Messiah, and the Prophet, take the word one after the other.

6th, lastly, There is in the holy books an harmony, a connection of ideas, which must never be lost out of sight, when we lay hold of them, or that we must look for, and discover when it is obscured by Hebraisms. This is one of the most certain signs of the goodness of a translation, and sense that is given to the hard passages when it is connected without effort to that which precedes, and follows.

Here are, Sir, in general, the most interesting principles of the Hebrew language. They are acknowledged as such by all grammarians, and I only follow their echo, by exposing them to you. Doubtless

H

you

you will say, you know them as well as I; it being an insult to think, you are under a necessity of being taught. And I answer you by a dilemma without reply; either you know them or not; if the latter, instead of giving you an insult by teaching them to you, I settle on myself a sure epithet on your gratitude. If the first, why do not you make use of it. Why is the explanation you give (Dissert. I. page 422) of the five first verses of Deut. chap. xxxiii. the most arbitrary that can be? I will examine your pretended corrections with the first post, and will shew, that the lessons you offer are no more worth than the manuscripts you make use of.

I am, SIR,

Your's, &c.

LETTER

LETTER IV.

SIR,

**I**F nothing else had been introduced in my plan but the appraising of materials on which you lay claim to improve the printed text, and give a pattern of the peculiar genius of the Hebrew language ; I think that the little I have said concerning it, would be sufficient to enable any unprejudiced person for giving an incontestible judgment on both objects ; but

*Arma virumque cano.*

I sing not only the arms, but the hero that makes use of them. It is therefore you whom I now attack personally ; together with the variations you quote as being of great consequence, whilst they only are ignorant productions, or gross inadvertencies of your manuscripts ; your imaginary corrections at least useless. In short, your inconsequent, and often contradictory arguments. But before I enter upon the matter, I think myself obliged to give, in favour of those who are not sufficiently

versed in the Hebrew, the explanation of the Massoretical words, which are found in the Hebrew text.

1st קרי (*keri*) means, read the word you see in the text, marked with a small circle (°) over it, as it is in the margin.

### EXAMPLE.

Margin.	Text.
<i>keri bagadol</i> הגדול קרי	Joshua xv. 47.
i. e. read הגדול [hagadol]	<i>bagadol.</i> הגבול

2d. קרי ולא כתיב (*keri velo ketib*) signifies, Read the word written in the margin, although it be not in the text; and then the place where the word should be is vacant, and marked by a circle.

### EXAMPLE.

Margin.	Text.
<i>ketib velo keli bajem.</i> באים קרי ולא כתיב	Jeremiah xxxi. 38.
that is, read באים ( <i>ba'im</i> ) although it be not written in the text.	<i>Narubom basin iarumim benay.</i> הנה ימים...נאם ה'

3d. כתיב ולא קרי (*ketib velo keri*) signifies, do not read the word, although it be in the text; and the circle is over the word that is to be suppressed.

## EXAMPLE.

Margin.	Text.
<i>keri velo ketib kamesh</i> חמש כתיב ולא קרי	Ezek xlvi. 16. <i>meoth kamesh</i> חמש חמש מאות
i. e. read not the word חמש ( <i>kamesh</i> ) although it be written in the text.	

4th חסר (*kassar*) signifies such a letter is wanting. Now that letter which is omitted, is put in the margin after that word, and the place where it ought to be set in the text, is marked by the circle.

## EXAMPLE.

Margin.	Text.
( <i>aleph kassar</i> ) חסר א	Numb. xv. 24. <i>lekatath</i> להט תא
i. e. there wants an א	

5th. יתיר יתירה (*ietherah or iethir*) signifies, that the letter which is marked with the circle, is superabundant.

E X A M P L E.

Margin.	Text.
<i>jatherab</i> ( <i>vau</i> )	Deut. xxxii. 13.
ו יתירה	<i>bamatbe</i>
i. e. the ו is super-abundant.	במותי
( <i>iod</i> ) <i>iather</i>	Psaln xvi. 10.
י תיר	<i>kassidca</i>
i. e. the י is super-abundant.	חסידך

I am not surprized that these notes have incurred your indignation; they put a stumbling-block to the fury you are possessed of, for finding faults in the printed text: but what astonishes me more is that you entitle them *corrupted* Massoretical notes. This assertion is too hazarded, and surely you are not sensible of the consequences.

Here you may see in what manner you express yourself, in your second Dissertation, pag. 328, and 329.

“ Although this kind of evidence I produce be new; yet it appears an excellent proof that the author of the ancient versions read differently our printed text. I will put together some of the variations of the Hebrew manuscripts, and

“ and then it will visibly appear, they are  
 “ the same lessons expressed in the Greek  
 “ version, &c.”

Afterwards you give two columns with  
 thirty-six Hebrew words; the one accord-  
 ing to your manuscripts, and the other  
 according to the printed text. Upon the  
 whole, here follow half a dozen only, for  
 I do not like prolixity.

## The Printed Text.

## The Manuscript.

Joshua xv. 47.

*bagaibull*

הגבול

*bagaiddoll*

הגדול 1st manuscript

Judg. xvi. 18.

*law*

לה

*lee*

לי 4th manuscript.

I Sam. ii. 3.

*velow*

ולא

*velow*ולו *idem.*

I Kings xii. 33.

*meolbarwd*

מלבר

*meleebow*

מלבו 2d manuscript.

Psalm xvi. 10.

*kassiedika*

חסידך

*kassidca*

חסידך 17 manuscript

Ezek. xlii. 16.

*amoth*

ות

*meoth*

מאות 3d manuscript

H 4

At

At the first view it appears very odd to me, that in shewing the difference that is found between the lessons of the printed text, and that of your manuscripts, you conceal not only the corrections done in the printed text by the Massoretical notes, but even deny *expressively* their being there, whilst they appear with an undeniable evidence in the printed editions, and especially in that of *Vander Hooght*, whereby you collate all your manuscripts. That little œconomy in truth is out of character. Behold in what manner they are marked in our printed text. Say that I impose upon it if you dare.

Marginal Corrections.	Printed Text.	Manuscripts.
	Josh. xv. 47.	
keri bagadol	bagaibull	bagadol
קרי read חגדול	הגבול	הגדול
	Jud. xvi. 18.	
keri lee	law	lee
קרי read לי	לה	לי
	1 Sam. ii. 3.	
keri valow		valow
קר read ולו	ולא	ולו
	1 Kings xx. 33.	
keri melebarw	miliebarw	meliebarw
קרי read מלבו	מלבד	מלבו
		iod

Marginal Corrections	Printed Text.	Manuscripts.
	Pſalm xvi. 10.	
<i>iod</i>	<i>iatbir</i> <i>kaffidecau</i>	<i>kaffidecau</i>
,	יחיר	חסיד
i. e. that the fe-	הסידר	
cond ' is su-		
perabundant	Ezek. xlii. 16.	
<i>keri</i>	<i>meoth</i> <i>amoth</i>	<i>meoth</i>
קרי read מאות	אמות	מאות

Secondly, it is manifestly proved, that the words first quoted give the printed Hebrew text the same lessons you find in your manuscripts, and they import the same lessons you read in the Greek version. Now see how I argue. By your own confession, the Massoretical notes are corruptions; therefore they corrupt the printed text. Now in corrupting the text, they render it *like* to your manuscripts, and the *Greek version*: consequently your manuscripts and the *Greek version* are corrupted; because, when one thing corrupts another, and by corrupting this, it renders it *like* to a *third*, this is necessarily corrupted, otherwise there would be no similitude.

3dly, I maintain that a great part of the thirty-six words you give for examples are not faults.

For

For instance, are the verbs that are in the singular instead of being in the plural, or those that are in the plural instead of the singular, so many errors? No, surely, had you the principles before your eyes, and made the application of them, you would not esteem them in that light. It is very extraordinary that you be inclined to degrade the Hebrew language from its primitive state, and put it at a level with the Western languages. But you will tell me, the marginal notes, my manuscripts, and the Greek version are for me, and shew me to be so many errors. . . . Is this all the honor you aspire at? I will shew you in what manner you are to appraise them.

Who has told you at first that the marginal notes, by indicating a lesson different from that of the text, always lay claim to declare a fault in the text? Nothing has less appearance of veracity. They are mostly made use of only to declare the Hebraisms, and give a warning to be aware, for understanding or translating the text, as if it contained the word they indicate in the margin. Do you think, for instance, that when the text imports *וַיֹּאמֶר* (*he has said*) in the singular *דִּבֶּר* (*he has spoken*), whilst the question implies many persons who

who have said or spoken, and that the marginal note tells you read *דברו יאמרו* (*they have said, they have spoken*) do you think, I say, that that note means, correct the text, it is faulty? Not at all. It only gives you a warning to translate them as if they were *דברו יאמרו* *they have said, they have spoken*. And in this case it is, where the genius of the language must be known, and the application of the principles performed, in order to distinguish whether the notes indicate a fault or an Hebraism.

You say that your manuscripts import as the marginal notes have corrected: I do willingly believe it, and this is just what unveils the ignorance of your copyist. Be therefore thoroughly convinced, that on 400 manuscripts you have already gathered or consulted, there are at least 380 framed on the printed text. The copyists who only understood Hebrew indifferently, did find in the text a verb in the singular, the nominative whereof was in the plural, they have taken it for granted, it was a solecism, and taking the note for an order of correcting it, they have substituted the word that was in the margin, to that which was in the text.

The

The same happens almost with the Greek version. The genius of the Greek language is quite different from that of the Hebrew. Would you have the translator to follow the Hebrew, word by word, and render it in Greek as *Xantis Pagnin*, did render it in Latin; namely, that he made of it a barbarous, and unintelligible version? He was forced to conform in his translation to the genius of the language in which he translated, as you would conform to yours, if you gave an English version; and then he was obliged to clear the Hebrew from its Hebraisms, and restitute in his Greek version the order that the peculiar genius of the Hebrew language seems to overthrow in its diction.

Whenever you find in one of your manuscripts a variation, whether it be right or wrong, that is equal to you; you burst into exclamations, as if you had discovered the famous *Cock-lane Ghost*. You embellish it immediately with a variation of the *utmost consequence*; and by a counter-blow, you honor the printed text with the epithet of *corrupted*. Let us therefore see whether you are so much in the right to perfume yourself with the incense of applause on your discoveries.

It

It is said in Levit. chap. iv. verse 29,  
 וְשָׂהַט אֶת הַחֹטֵאת בַּמָּקוֹם הָעוֹלָה *and thou shalt slay the sin-offering in the place of the burnt-offering.*

A light-headed copyist thinking that this word *in the place*, could be amphybological in Hebrew, has added in his manuscript אֲשֶׁר יִשָּׂהַט *where it is slain*: so that the sense it offers is found by means of this addition; *and thou shalt slay the offering in the place where the burnt-offering is slain.*

I would not be surprized if a French Doctor made that addition in his language; he is obliged to do it, because the signification of the word *instead*, and *in the place*, is really equivocal in that language; but I am astonished at a man, who giving himself out for the most sublime in Hebrewisms, does approve that edition, and is willing to make it pass for Hebrew, under pretence of taking off the amphybology of it: You do not know then that the Hebrew word מָקוֹם (*makom*) has no ambiguity; that it indifferently signifies *a place*; in short, a space capable of containing a body, and you will find with much difficulty in the bible a passage where it denotes any kind of substitution of a thing

thing in the place of another, and that it cannot consequently signify any other thing in the text, than *in the place where it is slain*. However, you exalt your miserable variations as a lesson *very remarkable, and happily preserved*. (Dissert. vol. 1. page 209.) What disadvantageous suspicions do you cause to raise on your knowledge, and faithfulness of your labour, by lavishing such encomiums to an idle fancy! Here follow others.

The fifth pretended correction you offer, (vol. II. page 328.) are the following words ויאמר להם *and he said unto them*, (Jud. xv. 2.) whilst one of your manuscripts reads ויאמר להם שמשון *and Sampson said unto them*. Had you examined your phrases attentively, you would have seen that the children of Judea spake to Sampson, and that he being by himself in his cavern, none but him could have answered, and consequently the word *Sampson* was not only useless here, but even misplaced; it being already mentioned in the same verse.

In your first Dissert. page 25 and 26, you compare the passage of the first book of Chron. xi. 3. where the printed text imports ויכרת להם דוד ברית *and David made*

*made a covenant with them, with that of the second book of Samuel, which imports דוד המלך the king David.* This omission of the word king in Chronicles, was, you say, *probably in the original bible,* because that word is found in a copy of the seventy in the library of the Vatican. A pleasant consequence indeed! And supposing this word *King* had originally been in the Bible at that place, would the suppression of it be a corruption in the printed text, or an omission of great importance? Is it not equal to say Lewis XV. and George the Third, or *King* Lewis XV. and *King* George the Third? See many more verses following in the same book, you will find many times named *David*, without the epithet of *King*.

In page 468 of the same Dissertation, you say that in the book of Samuel, chap. xxiii. 4. our text imports זרח בקר זרח וכאור *and as the light of the morning at sun rising.* You, having found in a manuscript זרח ה' שמש *at the rising the Lord of the sun.* Not satisfied of alledging such a blunder, you maintain that the word ה' (the Lord) is written very much to the purpose in that place. This passage should then be explained to us; for I defy any  
learned

learned man to give a legal sense to the lesson of your manuscript.

In your second Dissertation, page 187, you declare that you have found a manuscript that reads in Exodus chap. x. 18. ויצא משה מעם פרעה *and Moses went forth from Pharoah*, but that the printed text does not mention משה (*Moses*) and only says, *and he went forth from Pharoah*. Indeed, you spend to very bad purpose, *the time of the public*. The omission of this noun is not only a fault in the printed text, but the addition your manuscript makes to it, is absolutely misplaced. The two brethren were together. Had they been willing to add nominatives to the verbs that are in that verse, they should then have put, *Moses and Aaron went forth from Pharoah, and Moses invoked the Lord*. Why? Again, Because the two brethren were together; and surely Aaron did not stay after Moses. Secondly, Because when any prodigy was to be performed, or to make it cease, Moses was always the person whom entreated the Lord. Read the 16th verse of the same chapter, and especially chap. viii. verse 8, of the same book, you will find there this explanation word for word; it is as clear as the day. If you  
are

are so inclined to cover yourself with the mole's dim curtain, you may do as you please, but let others at least enjoy the blessing of light.

In the second book of Samuel; chap. xiv. 26. we find the word אֶבֶן (eben) employed to design a *weight* (a mercantile expression) and instead of that word which also signifies a *stone*, you have found שֶׁקֶל (*shekel*) in a manuscript, which has no other signification but that of weight; therefore this is a corruption also in the printed text.

Either your mind was busy somewhere else when you put that word in the number of the corrections in your stile, or you take those, who will have the patience of reading you, for imbecilities. How! Don't you know that the word אֶבֶן (eben) signifies at the same time, a *stone* and a *weight*.\* Did you never read then the holy scriptures? See therefore what imports the following passages.

Levit. xix. 39. מֵאֲזֵי צֶדֶק אֶבֶן צֶדֶק *just ballances, just weights.*

Deut. xxv. 13. אֶבֶן וְאֶבֶן גְּדוֹלָה וְקִטְנָה *divers weights, a great, and a small.*

I

Prov.

\* See the word weight in the Concordance of Alexander Cruden, printed in London, 1738.

Prov. xi. 1. ואבן שלמה רצונו *but a just weight is his delight.*

Idem xvi. 2. כל אבני כים *all the weights of the bag.*

Idem xx. 10. ואבן אפה ואפה *divers weights and divers measures.*

Had a French Doctor offered us that correction, without being wiser, he would have been less blameable; because the word *stone* is not used in his language to signify a *weight*: But I am surprized that an English Doctor should tell us that this word אבן *stone* employed for *weight*, is an error; because in English the word *stone* signifies, both a *stone* and a *weight*.†

After all, I confess, I should not upbraid you with such distractions; any thing ought to be pardoned a man who entitles himself a very skilful adept in the Hebrew language, and yet seemsto be amazed at

† A *stone* is a weight of eight pounds in London, and 12 in Hereford.

A *stone* of wool—or 14 pounds of wool. See *Boyer's Dictionary*.

See also *Dilworth's Arithmetic*, (or the *School-Master's Assistant*) page 13.

A stone of iron shot is	- - - -	lb.
A stone of butcher's meat is	- - - -	14
A stone of glass is	- - - -	8
A stone of wool	- - - -	5
	- - - -	14

at having found at the college in Lincoln, at Oxford, one *roll*, containing the *Pentateuch*, and another *Esther*, both without *points*, massoretical notes, and distinction of verses: Every body knows the *rolls* have never had neither the one, nor the other. You will agree with me that that declaration you make (1 Differt. p. 334.) is beyond distraction.

If this is the doctrine you are determined *to water us with*, and flatter our hopes (vol. II. last page) *with a shower that will fall on us as a beneficent rain*, I ask your grace for the public sake: don't hasten the windows of heaven to be opened; for if the single vapour of the cloud poisons us, what would become of us if it came to burst over our heads?

I confine myself on these few variations concerning the innumerable quantity you propose to us, and I think having sufficiently demonstrated, the ridicule, and weakness of them. I only add a word, namely, that I produce as facts two things equally true. The first is, that on 12000 variations which you have already found, and qualified of *great importance*, there are at least *Eleven Thousand Nine Hundred* in the same taste as those, which I just

give an analysis of. The second is, that beside the 12000 variations (which to all appearance you will quote in time and place) there are in your manuscripts more than 2500 which you will be well aware to quote ; because they are only *follies, ignorant productions, omissions*, or some additions, which only deserve contempt and derision. Let us go on.

Had you been satisfied to quote some variations, without arguing on their value, it would not have been half so bad ; but you have been determined to give a pattern of your corrections, and ~~that~~ unvails you. Doubtless you imagined that by choosing for a model an abstruse passage, one should not be able, or even dare either to weigh your arguments or appraise your corrections. Be undeceived, for I will do both, and shew that the first is as false and inconsequent, as the second is arbitrary and bad.

The matter in-question is, the second and third verses in Deut. chap. xxxiii. whereof you offer a new lesson in your first Dissertation, page 422. Here is what our printed text imports.

Verse 2. ואתה מרבבת קדש מימינו אש דת למו

Verse

אף חבב עמים כל קדשיו בידך. Verfe 3.  
והם תכו לרגלך ישא מדברתיך.

Word by word.

Verfe 2. *And he came with ten thousands of saints : from his right hand went a fiery law for them.*

Verfe 3. *Yea he loved the people ; all his saints are in thy hands : and they sat down at thy feet ; every one shall receive of thy words.*

I agree with you, that this passage is not plain to persons who have not studied the genius of the Hebrew language ; but those who are possessed of it, and know the prophetic style, easily pierce through those thick clouds. At first we are not to lose out of sight, that, here, Moses, who a few days before his decease, or perhaps at the very eve of it, gives to every tribe in particular a prophetic blessing. He begins, by recollecting to the Israelites, in a few words, the Majesty of the God they worship, his goodness and tenderness for them, imploring his protection for those who will be faithful to his laws.

וואתה מרבבת קדש *and he came with ten thousands of saints.* This is the lustre, and the brilliant court of the God of Israel.

מִיְמֵינוּ אֵשׁ דָּת לָמוֹ *from his right hand went  
a fiery law for them.* This is his goodness.

אֵף חָבַב עַמִּים *yea he loved the people.*  
This is tenderness.

כָּל קִרְשָׁיו בְּיָדְךָ *all his saints are in thy  
hand.* This is his protection.

I shall only explain these two verses, because of the five; these are whom you abuse the most, having found FIVE faults in nineteen words that compose them. Before I give the true sense of them, let us see your corrections, and the arguments you make to justify them.

You have immediately transferred at the end of the first verse וַיֹּאמֶר *and he said*; which in the printed text begins at the second verse. I don't charge you with it as a crime, because this transposition is very immaterial, and does not alter the sense in the least. This operation only serves to prove the eagerness you have for correcting right or wrong; for that verb was as well, and perhaps better at the beginning of the second verse, since the first is the title of the chapter. This is but a trifle.

You say in page 425, that "the words מֵרִבְבֹת קִרְשָׁיו (*meribebboth kodesh*) cannot regularly signify *with ten thousand of* "saints; because the general sense of the  
" *mem*

“ מ (*mem*) is *ab* or *absque*, *of*, &c.” and besides, this word קדש (*kodesh*) does not signify any thing else but *holiness*.

I agree with you, that the most general sense of the מ (*mem*) is *a*, or *ab*, or *ex*; but do these significations hinder the particular sense? Does it signify *less* (*cum*) (*with*) in Isaiah lvii. 8. ותכרת לך מהם *et pepigisti* (*fædus*) *cum eis*: and thou hast made a covenant *with* them? In Eccles. vii. 10. כי לא מחכמה שאלת *quia non cum sapientia interrogasti*; because thou hast not asked *with* wisdom.

Does it signify *a*, or *ab*, or *of*, in the 24th verse of the same chapter we are speaking of, and which imports ולאשר אמר ברוך מבנים that means, that Asher be blessed *by* or *of* his children. See therefore the English, or Latin versions.

But you will tell me, that מ is prece-  
dently employed thrice in the same verse,  
and constantly signifies *of*, or *ex*, or *ab*.  
Therefore it ought to have here the same  
signification.

I could immediately deny you, that this  
proposition ought to be rendered by *ex* or  
*ab* in the three places I have just quoted;  
because it seems to me, it would be more  
regular to say, That the Lord came *on*

Mount Sinai, than *from* that mountain, &c. But I will consent for a moment it be rendered by *ex* or *ab*, where is then the necessity of preserving that signification in a place where it cannot be adapted. You have been so well sensible of the impossibility of it, that you have been forced to alter the text, and substitute a name of place to the two words מֵרִיבַת קָדֵשׁ which signify *with ten thousands of saints*. And in what manner did you go to work? 1st, By changing the word מֵרִיבַת, that signifies, by means of the מ, *with ten thousands*, into that of מְרִיבַת (*Meribath*) which is the name of a place.

2dly, By giving to the word קָדֵשׁ (*Kodesh*) *holy* the signification of *Kades*, which is the name of another place; so that instead of translating as the text offers, *he came with ten thousands of saints*, you translate, *he came from Meribath Kades*. I cannot imagine what are your reasons for thus translating against the text, and good sense; but I am certain that your translation goes besides that against the rules of grammar; because the מ (mem) of מְרִיבַת (*Meribath*) is formative; and you will always find, either in the Pentateuch, or Psalms, or Ezekiel, that place called *Meribah*. Now  
if

if this  $\bar{\nu}$  (mem) is formative, it is not then a preposition ; why do you translate it then as if it were one ? It was necessary to add another  $\bar{\nu}$  before that formative ; or if you had a mind to be dispensed of it, you should not dishonor the different significations of that preposition.

Since we are treating on the general sense of prepositions, and you seem to repugnate that which gives them the extent that the sense, reason, and harmony of thoughts require. I will give you a striking example on the necessity of extending them.

St. Paul, in his epistle to the Romans, chap. i. verse 4, says, (speaking of Jesus Christ) your Saviour is mine :  $\tau\bar{\epsilon}$   $\sigma\pi\iota\sigma$   $\theta\epsilon\upsilon\sigma$   $\bar{\nu}\bar{\nu}\bar{\varsigma}$   $\theta\epsilon\bar{\nu}$   $\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\nu}$   $\delta\bar{\nu}\nu\alpha\mu\epsilon\varsigma$ ,  $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha$   $\pi\bar{\nu}\epsilon\bar{\upsilon}\mu\alpha$   $\alpha\gamma\iota\sigma\mu\omega\eta\varsigma$   $\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\zeta}$   $\alpha\bar{\nu}\alpha\sigma\tau\alpha\sigma\epsilon\omega\varsigma$   $\kappa\epsilon\kappa\rho\omega\bar{\nu}$

It is not doubtful that the general sense of these three prepositions  $\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\nu}$   $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha$   $\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\zeta}$  are viz. of  $\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\nu}$  in  $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha$  *secundum* according : *ex* or  $\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\zeta}$ , *ab* or *ex*, *by* or *of*, and consequently to your way of thinking it must be translated, *In potentia secundum spiritum, sanctitates ex resurrectione mortuorum. In the might according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection of the dead.* You will agree with me that this version is unintelligible ;

ligible; and I defy you, by leaving these prepositions in their general signification, to explain to us what St. Paul means. Let us therefore give them the extent they here require, for every thing will become plain.

The *end* of that apostle, in writing to the Romans, was to prove in his preamble the divinity of Jesus Christ. Thus after having said that he had assumed human nature in the stock of David, *ex femine David secundum carnem*, he adds, τῷ ὀρίθεντος υἱῷ Θεοῦ, this does not signify here *prædestinatus*, predestined, as it is commonly rendered; but *statutus definitus*, that has been decided, acknowledged, the Son of God, which is the true signification of the verb ὀρίζομαι. How has he been decided the Son of God? By three incontestible signs of divinity.

Εν δυνάμει. His might, by whom he caused to shake whole nature, and submitted her to his laws.

Εξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν. By his resurrection from the dead. Here you see the three tokens on which Jesus Christ has been, and ought to be acknowledged for the Son of God; and you see also, as I prove, that very often it is ridiculous to take the  
prepo-

prepositions in their general signification; because unintelligible translations are not only produced, but even the true sense of the holy scriptures is not caught.

Let us return to your work. You say that the word קדש (*kodesh*) has no other signification than that of *holiness*. Why then do the sacred writers make use of it to express that of *holy*?

Exod. xxvi. 33. בין הקדש ובין קדש *between the holy place, and the most holy.*

That of a sanctuary in Daniel, viii. 13. וקדש *and the sanctuary.*

כימינו אש דת כמו *from his right hand went a fiery law for them.* As you did not understand what it signifies, you have made a new lesson. Is it plainer? I am going to expose it, and the reader may decide it.

You attack immediately the word (דת) *dath*, and here are your words, page 427, "This word is Chaldee, and it is not found before the captivity, except in that place only, &c."

That is possible: But is it less Hebrew for its being Chaldee? Were it not Hebrew, would it be found in the same place, and under the same sense in the Samaritan

Samaritan Pentateuch? Would you find it in your Samaritan manuscript? For I do not mind much that No. 51, reads דוּתִי, and in No. 50, the ו (vau) be placed over the word as being omitted. It is sufficient for me that the two radical ד (daleth) and ת (thau) be there. Now, you are very conscious that the Samaritans have never written any book after the captivity.

Moreover, why then did you not equally dispute the verb אָתָה (athah) *he came*, its native place, which is read in the same verse? However, it is at least as Chaldee as דָּת (dath); and this unveils your prejudice; when a word puzzles you, as not being fit to gratify your fancy, you seek for some quibble about its birth, native country, and signification. On the contrary, when they are found to be conformable to your chimeras, were they all counterfeited, and even of an equivocal birth, you render them *lawful*, and give them a bright genealogy.

2dly, "That word (you say) is very  
 " obscurely employed, because it comes  
 " before the word אֵשׁ *fire*; and besides,  
 " the true word for law is תּוֹרָה  
 " (*thorah*)."

Were

Were I in need for new proofs to convince myself that you only know Hebrew very indifferently, and have but an imperfect knowledge of the genius of that language, I would register your two reasons. דַּת (*dath*) cannot signify law in this place, because it is joined to the word אֵשׁ *fire*. Don't you know that fire in the holy scriptures is the symbol of the divinity?

That the Lord is involved in it.

Exod. xix. 18. וַיֵּרָד סִינַי עֵשֶׁן בָּלוּ מִפְּנֵי אֵשׁ אֲשֶׁר יָרַד עָלָיו הָהָרָא *And Mount Sinai was altogether on a smoke, because the Lord descended upon it in fire.*

That God himself is a consuming fire.

Deut. iv. 24. כִּי הוּא אֵלֶיךָ אֵשׁ אֹכֶלֶת הוּא *For the Lord thy God is a consuming fire.*

Jeremiah xxiii. 29. הֲלוֹא כֵה דְבָרִי כֹאֵשׁ נֹאֵם ה' *Is not my word like as a fire? says the Lord.*

That he speaks in the midst of the fire.

Deut. iv. 12. וַיְדַבֵּר ה' אֵלֵיכֶם מִתּוֹךְ הָאֵשׁ *And the Lord spake unto you out of the midst of the fire.*

Idem, verse 15, &c. &c.

And you will not be persuaded, that the covenant he contracts with his people, and the commandments he gives to them, partake of the element under which the  
Divinity

Divinity shews himself, speaks, and acts? What obscurity, what contradiction do you find then in the idea that represents that expression a *fiery law*? You hardly are sensible of the sublimity and force of the expressions of the holy scriptures. If the Lord said to Jeremiah, chap. v. 14, *That the word whereof he made his mouth a depositary, would be a consuming fire*; with a much stronger reason, those which he pronounces himself, and the law he gives in the midst of the most bright and terrible apparatus, should be called *words, or a fiery law*.

“ The true word for law is תורה  
 “ *thorah*.” Yea, the generical word of *law*, and under this Hebrew substantive is comprehended the collection of all the Mosaical laws, whether ceremonial, moral, or judiciary; in short, the Pentateuch; which often has no other title but that word. But is it the Pentateuch which the Lord had in his right hand when he descended on Mount Sinai, he made the lecture thereof to all the trembling Israelites, and that which he gave to Moses wrote with his own hand, on two tables of stone? No, surely, those are the ten command-  
 ments,

ments, or decalogue, to which the sacred writer was obliged to give the name. דת (*dath*) which signifies an *edict*, a decree, an *ordonance*, rather than that of תורה (*thorah*). This appellation being too general to be here employed. Ah ! could he give to the decalogue a more *sublime*, *energical*, and *efficacious* epithet, than that of a fiery decree ? and is it not indeed a consuming fire for those who do not follow the laws of it ?

After having done your best endeavours to destroy a passage you do not understand, you substitute to it a version that has no sense, or at least offers a very ridiculous one ; this is the way you explain yourself at page 430, “ Among the extraordinary confusions of commentators, the Samaritan version has only preserved it ; for it expresses exactly the words of the text. In those places the versions stand מימנה נור אורה לון. Now the first word is the same as in Hebrew.”

Here I stop you immediately, because this is not exactly true. I have already upbraided you of it in my first letter, page 19. The Hebrew text imports, מימנו (*memeno*) *in his right hand*, in the masculine gender, that is referred to the Lord,

Lord, and your version imports מִימִנָּה (*memenab*) in the feminine, without being able to guess what this feminine affix is referred to. What signifies imposing?

The second word is נֹר (*nor*) which signifies in Hebrew a *lanthorn*, and in Chaldee *fire*. See which of both do you want.

The third is אֹרָה (*orab*) *light*.

Lastly, the fourth is לֹן (*lone*) which signifies *to lodge*.

So that uniting these four expressions together, I find that passage signifies, *It lodges in his right hand a lanthorn or a fire of light*. The Samaritan version has preserved us there a fine idea. I give you my compliments for it, and yet more for the riches of your discovery.

But if this version expresses so exactly the words of the text, why have you not rendered them all? You have only taken one of them for your new version; and still you have not taken it entirely; for the Samaritans import אֹרָה (*orab*) in the feminine gender, and you only offer אֹר (*ore*) and the best of it is, that your version is not plainer withal, since it does not always offer to us *but a fire of light*, or *a luminous fire in the right hand of the Lord*.

Thus

Thus, although you may do all your endeavours to find that the word דרת in your manuscripts is derived from אור (*ore*) because they have both a ך between two letters, and the א (*aleph*) and ר (*resh*) are those that have been corrupted, and changed into ד (*daleth*) and ת (*thau*); yet you shall not hinder me to think, and maintain, that your two manuscripts, namely, the Samaritan version, and your arguments are as bad one as the other, and that you cause to disappear from the text the most sublime idea, and the most energic expression, in order to substitute in its place a version as foolish as unintelligible.

In page 431, you offer us another correction. The text imports כל קדשיו בידך *all his saints are in thy hand*; and you correct וכל קדשיו בך *and be blessed all his saints*. Observe your way of arguing.

“ This lesson בך (*barek*) instead of בידך (*beiadeca*) is a very trifling variation, respecting the letters” —

True it is that nothing else is wanting but to leap over the י (*jod*) and change the ד (*daleth*) into ר (*resh*) which is a trifle.

—“ But it makes a great improvement in the sense of the line. . . . This

K

“ read-

“reading is confirmed by the Samaritan  
 “version בִּאֲרֵךְ which cannot signify in  
 “*manu tua*, but seems to be בֵּרֵךְ with  
 “the addition of an א, to express the  
 “*kamets* (ֿ), and the ך for a ך.”

If the Samaritan word בִּאֲרֵךְ cannot  
 signify in thy hand (as it is true) tell us  
 then, what can it signify? for I defy any  
 body to give it a sense, it being of no lan-  
 guage at all. But, you say, “It ought to  
 “stand here for בֵּרֵךְ *be blessed*; we are  
 “only to take the א as a letter put here  
 “to express the *kamets* (ֿ) and the ך for  
 “the ך.” Indeed this is not very hard;  
 but then, you forget, in the first place,  
 that you have proscribed the points; that  
 the Samaritans never knew them, neither  
 made any use of them, according to your  
 own confession in Dissertation pag. 305,  
 and you pretend that they have inserted an  
 א to express the *kamets*? I defy you to  
 quote me *any* Hebrew Bible where the  
 word בֵּרֵךְ *blessed*, is with an א, to express  
 a *kamets*. Secondly, that you correct the  
 Hebrew printed text on the Samaritan ver-  
 sion: And are you also obliged to correct  
 the same version? Give us then better  
 titles, or at least look for some, you are  
 not

not obliged to rectify: for there is nothing so vexatious than to see you blame, without reason, a word of the printed text; and when we are in expectation of seeing it replaced by a better one, you declare to be as plain and more followed, we are quite astonished to see another appear, you have been obliged to patch up, in order to give it a signification. Indeed, Sir, you jeer your readers handsomely.

The three last corrections consist in your having changed the ך's that terminate the words דברתיך and רגליך and denote the second person, *thy feet, thy words*, having put the verb שׂא in the plural number, which is in the singular in the printed text שׂא.

I will be satisfied with repeating to you in this respect, that, before any body takes upon himself the task of correcting a text, and especially one so precious as that of the holy scriptures, he must understand perfectly the language in which it is wrote, know radically the genius of it, have always the principles before his eyes, make the most exact application of them, and especially not cause the word to disappear where they are found contrary to the sense

he has a mind to present, as you have done in the 4th verse of that same chapter, where you have suppressed the name מֹשֶׁה (Moses) which is there. I can easily perceive that artfulness. You may be sure, that I will disclose it some day or other, as well as many others, which I now leave in silence.

Had you followed this method, had you recollected that the Hebrew often employs a determined number for an uncertain, that often the substantives are plural, and the adjectives or pronouns that are referred to them are singular, that the prophet often passes from one person to another, without any thing declaring that change, &c. you would not have taken so much pains to give an undigested sense to the words of Moses, and found therein faults that never were. There was nothing else to be done than to make a proper application of the principles; this you have not done, nor surely will ever do it, because you would overthrow to the bottom the edifice you want to raise on the ruins of the printed text, or rather of the Hebrew language. And indeed, what would your subscribers say, were you to sing the *Palinody*? They expect from  
your

your penetration thirty, or forty thousand gross faults in the printed Hebrew text of the Holy Scripture; they must be found at any rate whatsoever, or give them their money back again. You must chuse either one way or the other.

As I am not obliged, like you, to court the smiles, nor dread the frowns of any mortal being, (for no interest of any kind whatsoever, will ever make me conceal, nor invent any fault in the sacred text) I am determined to give you an explanation of these two verses. In order to do this, and find the true sense of them, they are to be divested from the Hebraisms under which the sense is involved.

וַאֲתָהּ מְרַבֶּבֶת קֶדֶשׁ *and she came with ten thousands of saints.* This number, *ten thousands*, is put here for the indefinite. I only shall quote one example to enforce it.

Psalms xci. 7. יִפֹּל מִצִּדֶּךָ אֱלֹהִים וּרְבֵבָה *a thousand shall fall at thy side, and ten thousand at thy right hand.* This is very commonly used in Hebrew.

וּמִיְמֵינוּ אֵשׁ דָּת לָמוֹ *from his right hand went a fiery law for them.* A fire of law, instead of a law of fire is an Hebraism.—

See the examples of this inversion in my third letter, page 86.

For them, namely, for the children of Israel; of whom it is spoken in the preceding verse. It must be observed that the pronoun is attended with a paragogical *kolem*, which ought to be expressed.

אֵף הֵבב עִמָּם *yea, he loved his people.* This noun, *people*, in the plural, does not puzzle a man who knows Hebrew. At first he has seen Abraham, (a) Ishmael, (b) Joseph, (c) and Aaron, (d) united after their death *ad populos suos*, to their people. This is a plural for a singular, and here it signifies the people of Israel.

כָּל קְדָשָׁיו בְּיָדְךָ *all his saints are in thy hand.* 1. The affix pronoun ך is not referred to the Lord, but the Prophet speaks of the saints of the people of Israel; and this pronoun singular precisely indicates, that under the plural expression *the people*, we ought to understand *the people* in the singular. 2. Its application is determined by the affix pronoun of the second person, ך *tua, thy*, which is thrice repeated in this verse, and you have taken them for three faults, because you thought that *ejus* is referred to the Lord. 3. This expression

(a) Genesis, chap. xxv. 8. (b) Idem ver. 17.

(c) Genes. xlix. 33. Deut. xxxii. 49.

to be in the hand of any body, signifies, to be protected, to be endowed with good deeds.

תָּבוּ לְרַגְלֶךָ word by word, *Collocentur ad pedem tuum*; and they sat down at thy foot, instead of *at thy feet*. This is a substantive singular, instead of a plural.

יִשָּׂא כִּדְבָרְתֶּיךָ every one shall receive of thy words. Here is a verb in the singular instead of the plural: This is a change of number. Examples of the same kind may be found *ad infinitum*.

What does it accrue from your imaginary corrections? A strange version, that has not one stroke of what Moses intended to say.

What, does it result from the application I make of the principles of these two verses? a clear intelligible sense perfectly amalgamated with that which precedes, and follows.

Here is yours according to your corrections.

Ver. 2. *Æternus de Sinai venit*

*Et venit Meribath Kadés,*

*In dextra ejus ignis luminis ipsis.*

Ver. 3. *Etiam diligit populos,*

*Et omnes sanctos suos benedicit;*

*Et ipsi collocantur ad pedes ejus,*

*Et accipiunt de verbis ejus.*

V. 2. The Lord came from Sinai

And he came at Meribath Kadés,  
In his right *a fire of light*\* for them,

V. 3. And certainly he loves his people

And *blesſes* all his saints :

And they ſat at his feet,

And they receive of his words.

Here follows mine on the text, divested  
from its Hebraiſms.

V. 2. *Æternus venit in Sinai*

Venit cum decem millibus ſanctus :

In dextra ejus ignea lex ipſis.

V. 3. Certe (tu) diligens populum,

(Sint) omnes ſancti ejus in manu tua ;

Conjunganſur ipſi pedibus tuis

Et accipiant verba tua.

V. 2. The Lord *came* on Mount Sinai

He came down ſurrounded

With an innumerable multitude of  
holy ſpirits :

He brought in his right hand

A fiery law to the children of Iſrael.

V. 3. Yea (O Lord) thou loveſt that people  
tenderly,

Showers thy favours

On thoſe among them who are faith-  
ful to thy laws, And

\* Or a *Lanthorn of Light*.

And they who are always humiliated  
at thy feet,

May there receive thy oracles.

I leave the unprejudiced Christian Hebrewists to decide which of the two versions is more followed, livelier, and more harmonious.

Indeed, mine is done after the printed text only, and involved with its Hebraisms, and yours after 450 manuscripts. The part does not appear scarce equal: But the scene of Mount Carmel removes my fear. Elias was alone against 450 Prophets of Baal. He was not less the conqueror over them. Think that your 450 parchments will not be happier against the printed text.

I have the honor to be,

SIR,

Yours, &c.

LETTER

## LETTER V.

SIR,

ONE of the particulars that has struck me the most, (when I began to read your Dissertation) is, the confession you have made (Vol. I. page 11.) in the following expressions. “ For whose satisfaction (*i. e.* “ of the people) and giving its due to the “ text now existing, it must be (and here “ it is with pleasure) observed, . . . that “ the greatest quantity of variations, and “ errors which are really found there, are “ chiefly in passages that are not immediately relative to the *faith* and *practice* of “ mankind, &c.”

At the sight of these words, I have formed an argument that any other besides myself would have equally done. If the great articles of the Christian faith are undefiled in the text we have, what reason is there then to trouble the church with corrections and innovations which are of no service at all to religion? What utility, nay, what profit does it accrue to the Christian

Christian of knowing, that in certain places **עָקַב** is wrote with a **י**, and in others **עָקָב** without a **י**; that before the captivity **דָּוִד** was wrote without a **י** and after **דָּוִיד** with a **י** &c. Has Jesus Christ enjoyed by this means less the metamorphosis of incarnation? Has he poured his blood less for our sake? Is he therefore less raised from the dead? At these first moments I have then contented myself to observe your work as simply useless; but you have not left me long in the error. As soon as you thought your reader was sufficiently lulled to sleep by this protestation, and the tedious parallel you have given us of some passages of the Book of Chronicles, and Kings, whose variations are really nothing else but pitiful niceties, all of a sudden you return to a passage, Psal. xvi. ver. 10. which touches nothing less than the raising of Jesus Christ from the dead. It is true, that at pag. 218, you do nothing but proclaim, as by the way, the error you find in the text; but you return to page 498, and treat it so tragically, that one cannot help laughing at your lamentations. However, as the matter in question is here an article of faith, or rather a mystery on which is founded the Christian religion, I am obliged to

to expostulate the inconsequence and contradictions of your arguments in this respect. Here follows the passage to be considered.

In Psalm xvi. 10. לֹא תִתֵּן הַסִּידִיךָ לְרֹאוֹת שָׁחַ which is always translated, *neither wilt thou suffer thine HOLY ONE to see corruption*; expressions which in all centuries have been understood for Jesus Christ in the tomb, with as much more reason, as he is the sole and peculiar object of this psalm.

Hitherto, they had not a mind to burst out into loud cries against the term הַסִּידִיךָ and esteem it an impiety, because it offered between the י and the ה a second ' (*i*od) that could make it be interpreted by (*thy saints*) in the plural, instead of *thy saint* in the singular. They faithfully relied on the unanimous sentiment of commentators and interpreters, on all the ancient, and interlined versions, even the strictest to be rendered at the expence of good sense, word by word, literally; all having rendered that expression in the singular *thy holy*: But you are not circumscribed in the sphere of the mobility; therefore this ' is for you a monster to fight against; without you, it would swallow

low

low Jesus Christ's religion up. What acknowledgements does not the Christian world owe to your perspicuity? What pen should be worthy of celebrating your exploits? Let us try to give an account of them.

You begin by declaring without any digression, page 218, "That the great arguments of the apostles St. Peter and St. Paul, (Acts ii. 27. and xiii. 35.) is invalidated by that error." These are your own expressions, and they are very hard indeed.

It is most certain that St. Peter and St. Paul have quoted that passage as a proof of the raising of Jesus Christ from the dead, that both have rendered the expression חסידך in the singular, *thy holy*, and proved as plain as the day, that that expression could only appertain to Jesus Christ. Was it the ' that made you sigh so much in their copy, or was it not? I know nothing of it; they have always rendered that word in the singular; and should you come at the end of eighteen centuries, to publish that this point overthrows the proofs of the apostles? this is like one who would make the publick believe that a gnat can overthrow the Tower  
of

of London. This is watering the ground of Pyrrhonism, to make it bud swifter in the hearts; this is, you force me to say it, demolishing with your own hands one of the foundations of Jesus Christ's religion.

Had a Jew started an argument like yours, I would not be surprized at it, as he never lifted up the veil that covers his eyes, but to cast a prejudiced look on every thing he thinks proper to weaken, diminish, and destroy the divinity of Jesus Christ. But that a Doctor, who gives himself for a Christian, and a famous Hebrewist, begins by declaring to the people, that the numberless faults in the text are chiefly in places, which are not immediately relative to faith, and which he, himself, makes with pleasure; as he says, an observation of, should come, all of a sudden, some pages after, to offer his reader a word, the corruption whereof appears to him *to invalidate* the proof of one of the most interesting articles of the Christian faith; that revolts me, and at the same time detects the danger of the work. But, perhaps, I am frightened without cause; an askew phrase may escape the most capable.

pable. Let us see the sequel of your arguments on this object.

You say (in page 449 of your first Dissertation) that "the manuscripts which have *happily discovered* that important lesson (i. e. חסידך instead of חסידך) are of No. 2, 3, &c."

A person that reads your work with a good faith, is tempted to believe that he had passed away all his life in the ignorance of *that important lesson*, if your manuscripts had not *happily discovered it*. What must then be his surprize, when knowing that the Reverend Doctor Rutherford, Professor at Cambridge, has mentioned you in his letter, *twenty printed editions*, (probably there are some more) where the same lesson is found in your favourite manuscripts? Either you were conscious of this anecdote, or not? if you were, you should have agreed to it, and not be satisfied with rashly quoting only one (that of Robert Etienne) as if you blushed for finding it congruous to your copies. You should have always present to your mind, that speaking against truth, or leaving it in silence, is the very same fault in a Reformer of the sacred books: If you were not conscious of it, you should have informed

formed yourself, before you had brought your reflections to light: You should have attentively examined, if the word חסיד'ך with a second ' (*i*od) was really a fault, and not to decide it one, without having proofs of it beyond all suspicion; and still less to make exclamations, as if there were in the world no more than one single copy of the *credo*, that a savage had carried away into his forests.

But you say (in page 498) “ In order  
“ to establish that the word חסיד'ך is cor-  
“ rupted, we must first add to the apos-  
“ tolical authority that of all ancient  
“ versions.”

Then the authority of the apostles, and ancient writers are those that now overthrow the word חסיד'ך: It is no more this expression, but that, which destroys the argument of the apostles. Then, that should have been said at first (page 218) and not to let imprudently slip, that the corruption of this expression invalidated the argument of the apostles. How can you be insensible that you open a new door to impiety, that all our unbelievers will henceforth abuse of your words, and answer nothing else to those who would speak to them on the raising of the incar-  
nate

nate verb, from the dead; that it is quite invalidated by the corruption of that expression: that a Doctor has told it, and that they abide to his sentiment? Are you then ignorant of those narrow wits who never read any of the works that strive their phrasy, whilst they devour even the most noted absurdities when they are analogous to their impiety? You may be sure that, very soon, you will be quoted in their works. What pity it is that Abbot *Barin de Fernai* has not been acquainted sooner with this anecdote! Certainly, it would not have escaped his notice.

“ *Secondly, that authority of the Massorets, which, though they ordered to print in the text the word in the plural, yet have ordered to read it in the singular, &c.*”

In order to unfold this argument (which by parenthesis does not appear too clear) let us ascend a moment to the principles, and make the application of them to your own sentiments.

I have given you in the beginning of my fourth letter, an explanation of the Masoretical notes, the mark whereof is a small round (°) that is put over the letter of the text: Moreover, I have added, that these small rounds did not always signify the

L

text

text to be faulty, but only served very often to give notice of an Hebraism, and to understand the word marked in the text such as it is in the margin, free from its Hebraisms. These are principles, which, I defy you to destroy.

On the contrary, you have taken great care to declare the Massoretical notes as corruptions : I have not been surprized at it, because I had a glimpse of the first page of your work, that you wanted at any rate, to find thousands of faults in the printed text. It was then quite plain that you should declare war to the notes that correct them sometimes ; forasmuch as admitting of their validity, you made all your manuscripts useless, which *very often* do not import in their text, but that which is in the *margin* of the printed text : However, you support very wrong your indignation against these notes. Here is the proof of it.

You were of opinion then, in your first Dissertation, page 21, that the name *David* in Hebrew was always wrote without a ' (*iod*) דָּוִד before the captivity of Babylon, and with a ' (*iod*) דָּוִד after its return. At first I ask you, if this proceeding is not making use of cavils on points, and endeavour

your

your to engross a volume with trifles and useless niceties : for, to what purpose can tend such questions ? I should like much better to hear the combats of those two nations who declared war to each other, for deciding by what end should fresh eggs henceforth be opened ; at least I am informed in the follies of Cyrane, that the little Boutians having been vanquished, the egg is to be broken by its larger end. But in your work, it matters not ; let us swallow the vexation, since we are at it.

You have found the Prophet *Amos*, who certainly lived before the captivity, and notwithstanding wrote *וַיִּבְרַח דָּוִד* *David* with a' (*iod*) *Hosea* has done as much in chap. iii. verse 5. How have you turned back to support your allegation ? very nicely. You have raked into all the printed Bibles ; at last you found that of Venice, where the *iod* has the Massoretical circle, that signifies, as you say, an error in the text ; *for in this margin it is wrote וַיִּבְרַח*. But then agree with your own self. What ! Do you reject with contempt the Massoretical notes as corruptions, when they unfold the sense of the text ; and do you admit of their validity when they support your pretended corrections ? And why have you not then

warned your readers likewise, that the very *same massoretical circle* was over the second *iod* in all the printed editions that import חסידִיךָ and especially in that of *Vander Hooght*, on which you daily collate your manuscripts? Has it not the same virtue on the י of חסידִיךָ than on that of דִּיךָ? Why? It is because it was your interest to penetrate at least into an error of great importance, and to give a *character* to your *manuscripts*, that *have happily discovered it*. For had you ingeniously said, There is in Psalm xvi. an interesting word, which could hardly be interpreted, if the second *iod*, that is found there, was not suppressed; but it has the Massoretical circle, and it is wrote in the margin such as it ought to be understood, you would have received an immediate answer. We have no occasion then for neither of your manuscripts, nor of your work, since the text corrects itself, that is sufficient for us.

Besides this, you have not only concealed the note that serves to interpret the word, but endeavoured to ridicule the Massora: You say, in page 469, vol. II. "this rule commands חסידִיךָ to be wrote חסידִיךָ" and you have said (vol. I. page 498, "though the Massorets have ordered

“ dered to print the word in the text in  
 “ the plural, yet they ordered in the mar-  
 “ gin to read it in the singular.” Is it by  
 derision or abstraction you impart to us so  
 contradictory an order? Is it to teach us  
 that the Massora has, and has not cor-  
 rected at the same time? or rather, Is it  
 not your own self, whom to get rid of the  
 maze that note entangles you in, and over-  
 throws all your arguments top over tail,  
 that have affected to throw on the Masso-  
 ra the contradictions which have escaped  
 your notice: Whatever you may think of  
 it, I am ready to disintricate your ideas;  
 yea, Sir, you speak more to the purpose  
 than you would; I am going to prove it.

I will grant *with pleasure* that the Mas-  
 sora has ordered to print מסירה in the  
 text, and this is the best proof that might  
 be given, that this word is not corrupted;  
 because it would be repugnant, and con-  
 trary to good sense, for giving orders to  
 write a bad word, and to command at the  
 same time to read it otherwise. However,  
 as this word, though ever so legal, yet could  
 it be ill interpreted, the Massora giving  
 orders to write it such as it probably has  
 been at all times, has given it at the same  
 time its true signification in the margin.

Yea, doubtless, there ought to be *קדוש* and the second ' *iod* ' does not corrupt the expression : But you reply, that this word, being wrote as it is, denotes the plural *thy saints*, whilst the expression ought to be in the singular *thy saint*. Ah, who has told you, that this *iod* is here the mark of the plural ? Are you so little acquainted with the holy scriptures, that you cannot find a multitude of words to which the *iod* is only joined to give them force ? Is it a more respectable letter than that which serves to design Jesus Christ's incarnation ? In my third letter I have quoted your examples of them. Are you not conscious that according to an old custom of that language, the *iod* is used to denote the *sheva*, i. e. the mute *e*, that characterises the singular ? See *Robertson, Dom Guarin, &c.* they will give you an information of it. Don't you know that of all the Bibles printed with points, there is not a single one which, in spite of the *iod*, has not pointed that word for the singular number ? Open the first that falls in your hand, and you will see, if there is not a *sheva* under the *י*. In short, don't you know that the Jews themselves read it in the singular in spite of the *iod*. See their own Bible, their

Prayer

*Prayer Book* printed at Mets de Lorraine, in the year 1765, by a Jew himself, at *Joseph Antoine*, Ordinary Printer to his Majesty, where the author has had the precaution of putting the Massoretical note in the text itself immediately after the word *חֲסִידֶיךָ* with the circle over the *iod*. I go further, namely, tho' ever it should be true that the second *iod* signified the plural, yet it would be no error. Don't you know then likewise that the plural in Hebrew is often used instead of the singular, in order to express the importance or excellence of the substantive in question? Ah, is not Jesus Christ the holy, by excellence? In a word, in order to prove that the second *iod* is not a corruption, I have in my favour the genius of the language, the grandeur of the subject it appoints, the arguments of the apostles, the approbation of the church, even the confession of the greatest enemies of Jesus Christ, and the unanimous sentiments of the interpreters, commentators, and all the versions, who reading that expression with a second *iod*, as it appears to have existed at all times, have rendered it in the singular; and you, in order to establish it an error, have no other titles but your prejudice,

judice, and the fatal desire for finding numberless faults in the printed text. Let me persuade you, that, if some Bibles have suppressed the second *iod* it only was by prejudice, and to obviate at the same time the abuse that could be made of it. Was it from a Christian Doctor who ought to be suspected? Or is it by laying hold with transport of a phantom of error that only exists in your heated brain, you are pleased to prove us the necessity of reforming the printed text? Make a better use of your time, Sir, or at least do not begin by declaring that all the errors you think to find in the printed text, are chiefly in places that have not an immediate relation to the faith or practice of mankind. For nothing is so contradictory than your words, and way of proceeding. The first seems only popped out to lull the public to sleep on the temerity of your undertaking; and by the second you only strive against an expression that has an immediate tendency to the chief articles of *faith*.

Had your discourse the least appearance of a little more diffidence of your own abilities, perhaps, I would have excused your contradictions, for I am not ill natured; and besides, it is impossible for a work of that

that importance not to let escape something of it, especially a workman who does not know perfectly the rules of his art. But you speak with the air of a master, you pronounce oracles ; you assume the quality of a Prophet, and that exasperates my patience.

“ *If the happiness or misery of mankind*  
 “ (you say in vol. II. page 579) *be necessa-*  
 “ *rily connected with their obedience or dis-*  
 “ *obedience to the will of the Almighty,*  
 “ *what great care should be taken, that the*  
 “ *will of the Almighty, when proclaimed*  
 “ *from Heaven, be accurately preserved in*  
 “ *the words of the original: Certainly, the*  
 “ *most solid judgment, the most masterly skill,*  
 “ *and the most sacred regard to truth, should*  
 “ *conjointly be applied, in freeing holy scrip-*  
 “ *ture from every mistake of transcribers,*  
 “ *and of printers, &c.*”

By thus exposing to us the necessary talents a man ought to be endowed with, who wants to give the original text its first eclat, you then forget, that you are the identical man, who undertakes that work ; you should not have left us so long in suspense, but should have told us at once. People cast your eyes on me, and take notice of my person ; I am Dr. K\*\*\*\*\*,

he

he who is endowed with the best judgement in the universe ; my science is incomparable, and you will never hear me speak a single word *against truth*. One would have laughed heartily at your bravado.

You give us another proof of diffidence not much inferior to the first (vol. II. p. 6.)  
 “ The authentickness of the printed New  
 “ Testament has been abandoned, (you  
 “ say) many years ago. The lectures of  
 “ variations have been published, the li-  
 “ terary world has been instructed, &c.”

I know that Doctor *Milles* has published a large Greek Testament *in folio*, with a large recollection of variations in the margin, whereof very few make a difference. But then, where have you been informed that this work has caused the printed Greek text to be abandoned ? What new degree of science has then acquired the literary world ? unless it be the talent of contemning the text ; I see no other. Who sees not in the first twinkling of an eye, that your exalting so much the undertaking of Doctor *Milles*, is only calculated for making to rebound on you the encomiums you confer on him ; for you make just in *Hebrew* the same work he has made in *Greek*.

*Greek.* You are also very careful to insinuate to your reader, " That the principles  
 " of reason, and good sense, that have en-  
 " gaged you to make use of the sacred  
 " critic on the second volume of Revela-  
 " tions, ought to be admitted in the first  
 " volume of the same topic." Thus you  
 approve the publication of Doctor *Milles's*  
 variations on the New Testament, in order  
 that yours may be approved on the Old  
 one. At least follow then his method;  
 he, being more reserved than you, has  
 contented himself with putting the varia-  
 tions in the margin, and left us our text  
 such as it is: But you pretend to make a  
 new Bible; namely, on hotch-potch of  
*Pere Houbigant's* interpretation, some con-  
 jectures of *L'Abbe L'Advocat*, some follies  
 of your manuscripts, begotten from your  
 own fancy; and you will give to this com-  
 position the respectable appellation of  
 God's original word? It is beyond any  
 doubt, that the infidels will then be con-  
 verted, and the great English nation will  
 be, under your auspices, a prudent and il-  
 luminated people: " Yea, (you say in the  
 " last page of vol. II.) when the phrases,  
 " words, and letters are restituted,

" Then

“ Then shall its doctrine drop, as the rain,  
 “ Then shall the rough places be made plain,  
 “ And the glory of the Lord shall be reveal’d,  
 “ And all flesh shall see it together.”

I have well heard in the course of my life some rodомontades, but never in the like strain. How dare you here bare-faced adopt to yourself the word of Isaiah? What! The salutary effects which the Holy Scriptures impute to his own doctrine, will they not begin to be resented but just at the time that your *new edition* is introduced into the world? Do you speak seriously? Is it in earnest you say that the doctrine of the Old Testament will then descend like a shower; whereas under the present state of the text, it only descends like dew? I cannot believe it, for this would be carrying pride so far as impiety.

But then when will this master-piece at last appear? This is a great question. You have only desired your subscribers ten years respite, and have cunningly added, “ Provided the subscription be sufficiently ample.”

With respect to the term of ten years, to be sure it is too short. Thus I advise  
 you

you very urgently to desire of your subscribers other ten years of delay, that you may have time to finish your undertaking. They will rather wait ten years more, nay twenty, if there be an urgent necessity for it, and be assured of the work. Only drop now and then some small fugitive pieces, as your Dissertations, or some explanations of difficult places as *superiorly* wrought as those of No. 2, and 3d ver. of chapter xxxiii. of Deut. This will prove to them at least that the work advances, and they will have patience.

“ Provided (you say) the subscription  
 “ be sufficiently ample, &c. And tho’ it  
 “ *be ever so large* (i. e. the state of collation  
 “ in 1762.) it cannot be imagined *large*  
 “ *enough to employ learned men* of all parts,  
 “ for collating manuscripts that may de-  
 “ serve it.”

An ample subscription, an employment for learned men, manuscripts that may deserve to be collated, are three objects I cannot look over without saying something concerning them.

With respect to the subscriptions, methinks you should be satisfied of the list you affect to offer the public at the end of each of the states of your collation, much more,

more, as I presume there would be a great deal to abate, were you to give the state of the expences, you declare with so much noise, for the employing of learned men. However, don't charge in your account the deceased M. L'Advocat, for neither he, nor the *young men* he employed for your sake, did ever receive any emolument for their trouble. Yet as it could happen that you might not be satisfied with the number of subscribers, I have another fine scheme in my head that I will convey to you for a retrieve. Cause a church-box to be put in all the churches of England, and especially in that of TŌTNESS, in *Devonshire*, and order to be wrote upon it, A BOX FOR THE PREPARATIVES OF THE PRINTED HEBREW TEXT. You may depend on your being well served.

The employing of learned men is a little more delicate matter. I begin by telling you, that I do not attack neither the sciences, nor the talents of the persons whose letters you quote in the state of your collations, and those who have done you service in the foreign courts. I do respect them sincerely, and entreat them to be thoroughly convinced of it. The learned  
men

men that surround you are those whom I will contest against. Let us take things a little higher; for I am vastly fond of order.

In the state of collation in 1762, you tell us that "Five OR six assistants were employed in your work, in order to make a quicker expedition."

A man out of humour would perplex you on that disjunctive particle OR; for you ought to be assured of the fixt number of your workmen.

What does your critic Dr. Hunt say? 1st, *That you made a vast progress in your work, and that indeed you advanced quicker than one could expect.* 2d, *That the collation having been put before him TO EXAMINE, he had found some lectures, which will be of great service to the sacred literature.*

As to the first part of his approbation, I do agree, that among FIVE OR six assistants, and YOUR OWN SELF, who probably made the *seventh*, you have collated in a year pretty near 101,130 verses.—Here is the proof of it.

Manuscripts

# Manuscripts of the Public Library of Cambridge.

N <sup>o</sup>		Verſes
68	A whole Bible —	23,099
69	Joſhua and Kings —	4,314
70	Iſaiah to Malachi - -	4,983
71	A Part of the Hagiography -	3,751
	Caius College.	
72	The Prophets, and Hagiſ, &c. Emmanuel College.	16,255
73	A Bible in <i>three</i> large vols. Trinity College.	23,099
74	The Pſalms —	1,527
	The whole Bible of M. Meerm n	
	in <i>two</i> very large volumes	23,099

The total ſum of the verſes 101,127

This makes about 48 verſes a day for each workman ; and I own, it is a very hard taſk, eſpecially for people whom you are obliged to teach at the ſame time, to read *Hebrew* and *Samaritan* : But my ſurprize is, that Doctor Hunt has not added in his approbation of 1764, the clauſe *And indeed faſter than one could expect*. For in 1764 you have collated 19 manuſcripts, containing 116,000 verſes. Is it becauſe  
you

you have made a new recruit of some learned men? For here are 15,000 verses more than in 1762. However, Dr. Hunt should have slackened the little compliment on this encrease.

Notwithstanding, his oblivion does not strike me so much, as the celerity of his operation, and penetration of his mind. How! In so few days he examines a collation that ~~you are a whole year~~ about, to perform with *six persons*? He observes there in the first twinkling of an eye, some ways of reading, that are of great service to the sacred literature, whilst in the space of twelve months, ~~you~~ and your *six* assistants, find there nothing else but trifles, and inconsistencies? What man! Is it not in the manuscript, No. 68, where he might have found such fine things? I gave an extract of it in my second letter.

Let us come back to your learned men. I am informed by a good hand, that the persons you employ at Oxford, are no less than bottomless wells of science. You affect not to associate to your labours but young men, who never understood a word of Hebrew; but you teach them with the utmost speed the Hebrew and Samaritan  
M alphabet,

alphabet, and you employ them immediately to collate.

I know that you have got one at Oxford, whom in the last war was a sailor. To all appearance he found less danger to uncypher old parchments on land, than to strike down the main sail at sea.

I know that about five year and a half ago, you recruited a young man of about fourteen years of age, whose science may be put in question. He hardly knew to read and to write, but in recompense, he performed the commission very right.

I know, that you had another, who was the son of a Jew convert; that his father, who was skilful in the Hebrew language, and had even taught him at Oxford during many years, has asked you, to no purpose, to work under your protection; but you had preferred his son, who being sixteen or seventeen years old, knew nothing at all.

The motives of your choice are not hard to penetrate: the father was *learned*, and the son *knew nothing at all*; this was sufficient to repulse the former, and make use of the latter. Such are, however, the greatest part of the *learned men*, who surrounded you, and will doubtless become famous Doctors, when your new Bible appears.

pears. Ah! Shall a body be able to dispute them this title, when it be known, they are those who have gathered together the subtle vapours that exhale from your head; and have formed with them that cloud which is to overflow England with the *most salutary doctrine*.

With respect to the manuscripts, I am curious to know, what is the characteristic by which you know whether they deserve to be collated or not. As I am not only conscious, but even do apprehend, you feast on the most despicable rags, provided they offer lessons differing from the printed text; I am going, for the last stroke, to give you some principles about this matter.

In order to collate faithfully, and with some advantage, the workman must be as ready to the sense, as to the letter, to the end he may distinguish an important lesson from a useless variation.

He must be capable to judge by himself, through the affinity of the language, and multitude of words, when an erasement is found, what was the word before the alteration.

He must thoroughly know the genius of the language, and the different ways of

expressing it, in order to decide between the two pieces he compares.

Lastly, before admitting of a manuscript in rank of a title capable of correcting another, he must examine all its context with the most scrupulous attention, for if by one good variation *found by chance*, he offers a multitude of them dictated by ignorance and folly, they must be deemed to proscriptio.

Had you proceeded in this manner, as you should have done, you should have justified it. From that moment, in order to remove all scruples, you should (and I summons you in the name of a public Christian) when you intended to give us your Bible, in the first place, quote the number of your manuscripts where you pretend to have discovered a *variation of great consequence*. Secondly, You should have named the libraries where they are deposited, to the end they might be examined, and see whether you offer all the variations that are found there. At this operation, your good faith and sincerity shall be known. Here the matter in question, is not to impose, for the case is too serious. How fearful am I that you will imitate that man, who promised in your capital

capital to go into a pint bottle! or that other doctor, a countryman of yours, who was to give a certain history in the *Arabic* language, has after twenty years left his subscribers in the expectation of the first chapter.

But, perhaps, you will tell me, that I am very bold, and even more presumptuous to rise against a work protected by so many illustrious lords, approved by the learned, and vainly attacked by the most capable of your nation, who you have reduced to a profound silence.

What concerns me, I answer you before hand, that neither boldness, nor presumption, have induced me to attack a work, that only tends to darken every time more and more the difficulties of the Hebrew language, and to furnish new weapons for incredulity. You put the book of the holy scriptures in a total conflagration; I found the alarm bell; there is nothing more natural.

Your work is protected by the most illustrious of England; that is very true, and this I find the most cruel part in your proceedings. You should not impose on so many honest people to whom you owe the most profound respect. Though ever

so virtuous and respectable they be, do they all know Hebrew ? Alas ! I only could wish to find in that number one single person who knew perfectly that language, and did with an impartial mind read attentively your two Dissertations, he very soon would open the eyes of all your subscribers.

Your critics are reduced to a profound silence. I agree to it, but I say no more to that purpose. Be grateful to my prudence, and only remember that the august name of his Britannick Majesty is at the head of your subscribers ; that an Archbishop of Canterbury (one of the most respectable prelates in England) who protected you ; neither are you indebted to the pretended solidity of your answers, the profound silence of your antagonists ; I have told you enough of it, if you are willing to understand me, and I am not afraid, you will force me to say any more of it. You may be assured, that I am informed of what passed about six years ago in England on your account ; neither am I ignorant of the discontent your undertaking has occasioned among the real learned of that nation, who were even prepared at that time to shew the falsity of it, but a  
political

political fear has restrained more than one hand, &c.

This, Sir, is one part of my reflection on your work, if you want any more expostulations, I am ready to give them to you. For the present, give me leave to resume in a few words, the ideas you have raised in my mind.

M 4 CONCLU-

## CONCLUSION.

**A** MAN that is determined to publish a work relative to religion, ought to make it solid, profound, and instructive: Is yours endowed with these three qualities? I think to have plainly proved in what I have advanced, 1, That your work is useless; because your own self agreeing that the errors you think to see in the text, are found in places that are not immediately relative to the faith and practice of mankind; the tenets and morals being, besides, irrevocably established, nothing looks so awkward as to come and fatigue the mind of a Christian, to let him know, that in such a word that has no connection at all with his faith, nor the business of his salvation, there is a letter omitted, added, or transposed.

2, That it is superficial; and indeed the weakness of it is discovered by your arguments; the extravagant confidence you have of your MSS; the defect or use and application of the most obvious rules; and the

the genius of the language (and what is a necessary consequence) by the innumerable multitude of faults you imagine to see therein. In spite of that, had it only these two bad qualities, I would have kept silence in your behalf, as I did in that of *P. Houbigant*. For think not, I attack you because you are an Englishman: No, Sir, my heart is ignorant of the ungenerous motions of antipathy; and any capable mortal is both my brother and my friend. I have left *P. Houbigant* undisturbed.

Why? It is because after having made a deduction of about seven or eight hundred faults, which he thinks to have found in the book of Psalms only, I apprehended them to be many ravings that were not worth while to be contested. That the text of the Psalms went equal with your ancient manuscripts, and that *omissions, additions*, words, phrases, and a whole verse, was found there; nay, words that *give no sense at all* to the concatenation of the passages; even such words as are neither *Hebrew*, nor any language. Lastly, about thirty marginal corrections in the Psalms of *Vander Hooght*, which he has inserted in the text.

Why

Why again? Because I had a glimpse in his work of some Jewish principles. For instance, instead of the word ה' (T.) he has affected to make use of the expression אדני (Adonai) or שדי (Shaddai) which is common among the Jews; for they don't pronounce the word ה' (T.)

EXAMPLE.

The Text in the Psalms of <i>Vander</i> <i>Hooght.</i>	The Text in the Psalms of <i>P. Hou-</i> <i>bigant.</i>
--	---

Psalms. xc. 17.

ה' אלקינו

אדני אלקינו Adonai  
Elohehenen.

Idem civ. 16.

ה'

שדי Shadai

Idem cxlii. 2.

ה'

אדני Adonai.

Lastly, Why? Because I have seen that his work made no sensible impression at all on the public, and his volumes *in folio* were for no other purpose but to fill a void corner in some libraries, where, for which reason, they allowed them a place.

But you proclaim yourself with too much eclat, and from that time your undertaking becomes dangerous; this is what I have yet to prove.

We

We have in France (and perhaps it has strained in England) a new religion, which is called Materialism. Though she is a daughter of vice and impiety, yet she has not made a less rapid and shining fortune. Wisdom, honor, virtue, reason, religion, sentiments, all have disappeared at her presence. I will endeavour to give you an idea of it.

In the beginning of this century, reason was yet in vogue. Every man of good sense who was inclined to enter into himself, and reflect on his own existence, said, I have a consciousness, that, independently of that flesh which is only a coarse matter, and liable to corruption, I have something within myself that displays my faculties of reasoning.—Now that something, surely, is not matter; for organize matter as much as you please, it never shall reason: If that something is not matter, it is then a spirit; for there is no medium between spirit and matter, and every being that exists is necessarily either the one or the other. If it is a spirit, it cannot be subject to the revolutions of matter, and consequently cannot be destroyed as matter is, by the dissolution of its parts; because  
a spirit

a spirit has none, but only by annihilation; it must necessarily either be annihilated or continue existing after the dissolution of the matter to which it is joined.

Nothing can be created nor annihilated by itself; therefore if my soul is annihilated, she only can be reduced to that negative state, by the same power that has created her. Now there is only one God, who can create and annihilate.

Therefore there exists one God: if he does exist, he must necessarily be eternal and infinitely perfect, otherwise, he would be no God; if he is perfect, he must be just; if he is just, he cannot annihilate my soul. Why? Because as he has created her free, rational, and capable of acting, he would act against his communicative justice, should he not use her according to the use she has made of her reason and liberty.

If it is diametrically contrary to God's perfection that my soul be annihilated, she then continues existing. If she continues existing, it is not doubtful but that after the destruction of matter to which she inheres by a superior will, the first efforts of her liberty will be towards her centre.

Now

Now which is the center of a created spirit? It cannot be but an eternal spirit, *i. e.* a God. The Divinity is then whom she will lively adhere to, after being free of the fetters that retained her captive, in order to be united as to the center of her rest and eternal happiness.

If Divinity is the centre of my soul's happiness, and if he ought to use her according to the use she has made of her reason and liberty, he then is, at the same time, my judge and reward; then I ought to invoke him, and pay him a worship. What worship shall I pay him? that worship, I know to be agreeable to him. How shall I know it? By tradition; by the documents of my fathers, and especially respecting those books, since they all teach me the worship I ought to pay my benefactor, and the road my soul is to follow to be united to her Divinity. I ought therefore to invoke that benefactor, since he is the spring and centre of the happiness where my soul, by her essence, necessarily tends, and where it cannot arrive but by his help and goodness.

In this manner the honest man used to argue not long since. At the present time, the whole scene is altered; we have no  
souls;

souls; we are no more than mere machines; a little better organized than a marble statue, and that is all. There is no more a God, or if there be one existing, he is no more than a mere passive being, who, concentrated in his own glory, is as indifferent to our prayers, as insensible to our outrages. We have no more religion, because the books that contain it are no more than a compilation of dreams; those who have composed them are impostors, and the wisest laws, and purest morals that are found therein, are only the productions of a political fanaticism.

Who could believe that in so luminous an age, (and what is worse still in a Christian kingdom) so many extravagancies, might have found access? However, they found it; and the followers of this new system, after having precipitated themselves from one abyss into another, are now without God, soul, religion, and even without reason. These are however the substances who call themselves Philosophers. Could so charming an appellation be more unworthily profaned, as to decorate brutes, machines, in short, automaton with it, for whom wisdom is a chimera, virtue a phantom,

phantom, and the most heinous of crimes wantonness?

I only inform you, Sir, of these anecdotes, so shameful to the nation, to prove how dangerous becomes your undertaking at the present age. You are sensible that one of the means that is most daringly employed against the Christian religion is the obscurity of the Holy Books. What acclamations of joy will not express our unbelievers, when they come to be informed by your works, that the primitive spring of versions is absolutely corrupted! You may be persuaded, they will abide by that decision, and will laugh at the promises you make, to give it its first purity: and it is very possible they will desert at random on the Hebrew Language, (which they do not know) as they do on so many other matters they understand nothing of. What! Sir, at a time, where, under the imaginary fear of exasperating yet the incredulity of men, they deem it almost a crime in the zealous Christians, for giving their sentiments on the manner of interpreting the Sacred Books, and for the plainly proving the holiness, and fruitfulness of them? Give me leave to tell you, that

that by so doing, you deliver into the hands of incredulity, a shield, at the shelter whereof, it will always resist the most piercing darts of reason, faith, and religion.

I have the honor to be,

SIR,

Your's, &c.

POST



POST SCRIPTUM.

**I** WAS in the course of printing this work, when occasionally I fell on a letter of Dr. Kennicott, dated in the Haymarket May the 22d, 1770, and inserted in the article of *literary news*. That piece has raised in my mind some few reflections. As they are quite analogous to my work, I think myself obliged to bring them to light. Dr. Kennicott expresses himself in the following manner :

“ You inquire after the object of my  
“ researches on the Hebrew Bible ; I am  
“ going to satisfy your curiosity. I sent at  
“ my expence a literate man named *Mr.*  
“ *Paul Jacob Bruns Lubequoës* for that  
“ purpose. He must go through *Paris*,  
“ and view the borders of the *Rhine*,  
“ *Switzerland, Italy, Germany, and Hol-*  
“ *land ;*

“ land; consequently he will go and see  
 “ the Synagogues of *Strasbourg, Franc-*  
 “ *fort, Worms, Venice, and Amsterdam.*”

It is a matter of doubt to me how much money the Doctor has given his envoy for his voyage; but he would not have done amiss to add to it some *thousands of pistoles*, in order to build a Synagogue at *Strasbourg*: for there is not only none there, but no Jew *inhabits* that city: they have not even the liberty to go, and stay there, without paying so much a day; they should not dare to remain there a night. This anecdote is known to every body: How is it possible that the Doctor is ignorant of it?

“ He will examine all the manuscripts  
 “ of the Hebrew Bible, or some part of  
 “ that Bible which are anterior to the in-  
 “ vention of the press; and the most an-  
 “ cient will deserve the greatest attention,  
 “ as being nearer to the source.”

I will suppose that the envoy *Lubequois* finds open all the Synagogues of the different countries he has an order to run through in Europe. What will he find there? Some rolls of the *Pentateuch*, and that is all. They contain yet the same corruptions

corruptions that the Doctor imagines to have discovered in the *printed* Hebrew Pentateuch ; and I defy him to prodnce any manuscript of the Jews Synagogue that differ from the printed Pentateuch, in the important passages, he says, to be corrupted ! With respect to the rolls of *Esther*, the Doctor is not then sensible, likewise, that they are not kept in the Synagogues, but that the Jews keep them at home, and do not carry them to their Synagogues but only one day of their *carnaval*, which is the only day in the year, they read in it. He should have instructed his envoy of all these minute anecdotes. After all, the envoy is perhaps wiser in that respect than who sends him.

The Doctor commands his deputy to examine all the manuscripts that are *anterior* to the *invention of the press*. Such an order is easily given : But will he find a great many of this kind ? This is a question that has somewhat the air of a problem. Let us try to resolve it.

It is a fact that before the invention of the press, the Jews were possessed of a great number of manuscripts of the whole

Bible, that they were very careful to preserve and transmit to their posterity from one family to another. These manuscripts were found, ancient, and nearer to their source than all those that Mr. Kennicott could find at the present time in the Christian Libraries in Europe. Those manuscripts subsist no more at present; and if they should subsist, it is neither at *Venice*, nor at *Strasbourg*, they would be found, but in the seven Jews congregations I am going to speak of.

It is very obvious that more Jews, and even learned Jews, were in *Spain* and *Portugal*, than in any other kingdom of the world. After having resided there whole centuries, they were expelled from thence: and it is from the ruins of that wandering and exiled nation from those two empires, that are formed the seven Jews congregations of *Bordeaux*, *Bayonne*, *Leghorn*, *London*, *Amsterdam*, the *Hague*, and *Hamborough*. These are the true places where a quantity of found ancient manuscripts of the whole Bible could be found; if a great part were not lost at the time of their expulsion. Besides, it is certain, that after the invention of the press, they did

did very little trouble themselves with manuscripts, because the printed copies suffice them. *Ximene's Bible* was printed in their presence after the most ancient, and correct of their manuscripts. Is the Doctor willing to make us believe that a whole nation, so concerned as the Jews nation is, in the preservation of a book, that contains the religion they profess, would have kept silence, had they seen it printed differently from the manuscripts? Nothing can be more incongruous to good sense; therefore, I say, the Doctor is making now a fruitless expedition, and consequently a useless expence. 1st, Because if we except the *Pentateuch*, and the book of *Esther*, which the Jews always keep manuscripts of; the former in their Synagogues, and the latter in their houses, under a Rabbinical pretence that *Moses* has given them *the Five Books wrote* by his own hand, and the book of *Esther*, has been delivered, wrote by *Mordecai* and *Esther*; his envoy will find very rarely by them any other manuscripts; because again (the two books we are speaking of excepted) they make use of the printed Bible for the prophets, and other books.

2d, Even supposing he should find them, he has nothing else to do but to examine them thoroughly, for he will see, they are exactly conformable, and even verbally to the manuscripts that are found in the *three or four Synagogues* at London.

" It is already ten years (continues  
 " Mr. Kennicott) that we are busy at this  
 " labour, under the protection of the  
 " King of England, with the assistance  
 " of the chief Jews of England, and many  
 " other persons."

That the King of England protects the work of Dr. Kennicott is not hard to believe. His august name is really seen at the head of the subscribers. But what does it result from thence. A great honor to the performer—and not a grain of goodness more to the performance: and besides, are not Kings daily deceived as well as particulars? With respect to the assistance of the chief Jews, this assertion is a little too strong, and surely the Doctor's mind was busy with something else when he committed this to paper. I am apt to prove him, that ever since the beginning  
 of this

f this undertaking, till 1767, there was not a Jew of any country whatsoever, that wrought under his direction, except a *Sailor*, and some *young men*, who did not know to read Hebrew. If ever since 1767 he has employed and associated any person to his work, I cannot tell; neither do I pretend to dispute with him on that point.

“ My undertaking has always been  
“ criticised by some Jews.”

I am not surprized that the undertaking of Mr. *Kennicott* has been criticised by some Jews; but I am more so, that it be not blamed, and despised by all the Jews in general; for the whole nation must be enflamed to be accused of having maliciously corrupted the Bible, *i. e.* the only book that contains their *faith* and *religion*, for which they have always had the most profound veneration, and to which it is by them so severely defended to add, or diminish a single word.

“ And applauded by others.”

That, I will never believe: Because, if Mr. *Kennicott* had really found some ap-

provers among the principal Jews, surely, he would not have failed representing them in the State of his Collations: They appear every year, decorated with the names of a croud of Christian approvers, who do not know Hebrew. Is it probable, he might have forgotten to put there such as are capable in that language? This was possibly the only means for giving a kind of credit to his work. No, Doctor, you will not find a single Jew who applauds your undertaking; all in general blame it, and condemn it; unless you may have begged the approbation of some Jews that have quitted their religion for a mercenary motive. In this case they will applaud it as much as you please; and by the same motive, will frame manuscripts for you of the remotest antiquity. Pay them handsomely, and you will have very soon a Pentateuch wrote from *Moses* own hand, and other books, by *Exra* and *Hillel*.

Mr. Kennicott finishes his letter, saying,  
 "That his undertaking should displease  
 "no body, since his sole view is to ex-  
 "postulate truth, and fix the real words  
 "of *Moses* and the Prophets."

Here

Here is, for instance, an argument I am not willing to give a name. How! Ever since eighteen centuries that Moses and the Prophets have entered the hands of so many skilful people, none has yet expostulated truth, nor fixed the real words of their work; and was it necessary that Providence should raise up Doctor *Kennicott* for that purpose? that is a little too hard to swallow. Doctor *Kennicott* must give me leave to tell him that the Christian world will never adhere to him in that respect; that they are satisfied with their printed text, and that all sensible people, both Christians and Jews, will always be enflamed for seeing him lay so daring a hand on that sacred book. Therefore let him not take it amiss, if I maintain, that his proposition is false in every respect; that his undertaking must displease every body, because it is temerary, and only fit to make an infinite injustice to religion, by unreasonably spreading forth clouds on the purity, authenticity, and reality of our printed Bibles. I say more, it is a chimerical proposition, and impossible to be executed, because, to conclude, he necessarily should have the Original Manuscripts

scripts of the Bible, *i. e.* those that have been wrote by *Moses himself*, the Prophets, and authors of the sacred books. Now the Doctor may rake into the archieves of the four quarters of the world as much as he pleases, he may be sure not to find them; and though ever so ancient be the real or fictitious date of a manuscript, it always will be posterior to them of a great number of centuries, and consequently, we shall find ourselves together in the same case, he for finding there numberless miserable variations, which he will cause to sound with eclat, and engross his collations with; I, for maintaining him, that that manuscript, though ever so crazy, is not superior in goodness to those, that Cardinal *Ximenes* has made use of to print the Bible.

It is then useless that Mr. *Kennicott* should recommend, among others, the manuscripts of the Escorial, and some other places in Spain. Here is my reason for it. Either they existed from *Ximenes's* time, or not: if they existed, there is no doubt, but that that Spanish Cardinal will have made use of them for the printing  
of

of the Bible; then the Doctor cannot reasonably pay them that respect; because, according to him, they have cooperated in the corrupting of the holy books: If they did not exist, then they have been framed ever since the printing of them; consequently no credit ought to be given to them.

Before I make a recapitulation, I must impart to the public a short anecdote, which is worthy their attention. Doctor *Kennicott* being at Paris, and visiting *Sorbone's* Library, chose there twenty-eight manuscripts which he thought could be of service to him, for the scheme of reforming the Bible. Note, that among those twenty-eight manuscripts there are three, viz. No. 25, 28, and 254, that are wrote in Rabbinical characters, and just the Doctor knows not to read a single word of them. And the more curious of all is, that at the same moment he rejects No. 20, which is a Bible wrote in the same characters. I beg him to tell me then, for what reason does he dishonor that poor No. 20, whilst he makes a fortune for his brethren, perhaps, unworthily,

unworthily, and which they know no better than him.

I resume then, and say ;

At the present circumstances, Mr. Kennicott could not do a more dangerous expedition to his character and undertaking, than sending in that manner Paul Jacob Bruns de Lubequoer to run through the countries. Why? Because it is evident, this is only designed to gain time, and lull the subscribers to sleep. It is very amazing, that ever since ten years, and more, that he proclaims his work with so much emphasis, and does not cease stunning the public with the excellence of more than four hundred manuscripts, which must serve to reform the printed text, he be yet obliged to send an express to fetch others in the whole inhabited world. If more than four hundred manuscripts that are presented to us as very excellent do not suffice to reform the Bible, five thousand more will not accomplish it.

But at last let us suppose that Mr. Bruns, after having travelled in Europe at the expence of the Subscribers of Mr. Kennicott, comes back after three or four years absence,

sence, and brings really with him a good store of ancient manuscripts, true or false, no matter, shall the work after all come to light? No, some years will be spent in sifting these new comers; some pitiful variations will be extracted from them, and great care will be taken to decorate with them every year a State of Collation, especially approved by Dr. *Hunt*, and when the Students of Mr. *Kennicott* will know no more what to do, he will give notice to his Subscribers in the Daily Papers, that he has just deputed, at their cost, a new emissary towards *Mount Nebó*, to look there after the cave where the Prophet *Jeremiah* has inclosed the *Ark of the Covenant*, and to take out of it the Pentateuch, wrote by *Moses's own hand*, which is there kept ever since more than 2350 years.

This is the road Mr. *Kennicott* will follow: and what will accrue from so much noise!

*Parturient montes, nascetur ridiculus mus.*

Doctor, I have said all—save the reply.

Now, Sir,

Vous pouvez à présent, Seigneur, me  
gourmander ;  
Tout ce qu'en vous quittant j'ose vous de-  
mander,  
Croyez (à la vertu je dois cette justice)  
Que je ne suis pas seul, & j'ai plus d'un  
complice ;  
Et que tous vos travaux ne serviront de  
rien,  
Si j'en crois les discours du Juif & du  
Chrétien.

*Par. of Rac.*

6 MA 50

**F I N I S.**



e  
e  
)  
n  
e  
a